Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XIII., No. 9. DECEMBER, 1923.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Latin Christianity 465
Alfred Fawkes, M.A.

Religion and Science 476
E. W. MacBride, F.R.S.

The Burial of Lord Morley 490
Hubert Handley, M.A.

Prayer Book Revision at the Cross-Roads .. 496
The Editor.

The Abiding Significance of Jesus 501
Cyril Emmet and his Faith.
E. W. Barnes, Sc.D., F.R.S.

Book Reviews:—
Dr. Schweitzer in a New Role 506
Textual Criticism for the Unlearned .. 508
Beauty and Religion 509
Sunday School by Correspondence 510
Malebranche 510

Correspondence 511
Papers in Modern Churchmanship; Church Tutorial Classes; Confession in the English Church; Prayer Book Revision.

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.
NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 110–112 Lambton Quay, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

PROGRESS.

A CENTURY ago you would probably have purchased your Groceries by the glimmer of a smoky oil lamp in the front room of the shopkeeper's residence.

To-day we invite you to 'phone
"Oxford, Four"
and hey presto! our Motor Van will arrive at your door with the goods ordered.

GRIMBLY HUGHES & CO. LTD., THE CORNMARKET STORES, OXFORD.
Quality Grocers since 1840.

Two Books on the Reformation and To-day.

By the Rev. L. ELLIOTT BINNS, B.D.

ERASMUS THE REFORMER: A Study in Restatement (Hulsean Lectures, 1921—1922). Methuen, 5s. net.

'The Reformation that has been is Luther's monument; perhaps the Reformation that is to be will trace itself back to Erasmus.'—*Beard.*

THE REFORMERS AND THE BIBLE. Heffers, 1s. 6d. net.

A study of an important subject upon which there exists a great deal of misapprehension.

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

(Founded by Bishop BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., D.C.L., at Ripon in 1898, moved to Oxford in 1919).

Warden—The Right Rev. H. M. BURGE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford.
Principal—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Vice-Principal—Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford.
Chaplain—Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.

Full particulars as to the Course, terms, fees, exhibitions, &c., can be had on application to the Principal.

Laymen who desire a broad-minded, sympathetic and well-educated Clergy can materially assist this end by contributing to the Exhibition Fund of Ripon Hall.

TAILORS SINCE 1846.

CASTELL & SON.

OUTFITTING ADDED IN 1873.

University and Clerical Tailors,
Robe Makers,
13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.
(Opposite Balliol College).

Representatives of the Firm are frequently travelling, and appointments are respectfully solicited.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1923. Vol. XIII.

LATIN CHRISTIANITY

By the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, M.A.

'*POUR faire l'histoire d'une religion, il faut ne plus y croire, mais il faut y avoir cru.*' This is as true of the ritic of a religion as of its historian; and Friedrich Heiler, he author of *Der Katholizismus: seine Idee und seine Erscheinung*[1], an encyclopaedic work, satisfies both conditions. Till the policy of Pius X strained the situation beyond bearing, he was a Catholic. Then—'when they persecute you in ne city, flee ye to another': instead of either sacrificing conscience by submission, or imperilling religion by withdrawing rom Christian fellowship, he found his natural home in the Protestant Church of his country. The present volume is the utcome of a course of lectures delivered in Sweden in 1919, nd published under the title, suggested by Harnack's famous reatise, of *Das Wesen des Katholizismus*. The reception iven to them both by Catholics and Protestants was cordial; he intellectual atmosphere of Germany is unlike ours. The ormer, while seeing in the book 'the most formidable attack pon Catholicism since that of Strauss,' appreciated the writer's stimate of its religious values; the welcome given by the latter o the distinguished convert was none the less cordial on account of his grateful memories of his former communion,

[1] Munich, 1923. *Verlag von Ernst Reinhardt.* pp. xxxviii, 704. 10/-.

which they contrasted with the virulence with which Pro testantism is, as a rule, assailed by seceders to Rome. If seems to English readers with a certain knowledge of bot Churches that distance lends enchantment to his view of wha is no doubt the more imposing of the two bodies, it should b remembered that German Catholicism has never fallen so com pletely out of touch with ideas as Latin and Anglo-Irish; an that continental Protestantism appeals to the imagination les than our own.

2. To see in Catholicism no more than a polity or a creed— though it is both—is to take that barren virgin Controversy fo Criticism. It is a religion—in Renan's words, '*la plus carac térisée, et si j'ose le dire, la plus religieuse des religions*'; bu as long as we confine ourselves to the dissection of its body w shall fail to detect its soul. The method leads nowhere Catholicism is, indeed, a very mixed magnitude; one which is easier to defend from without than from within. This i particularly the case in our own time, when the memories o the Terror of 1903—1914 are still living; its dead unburied the wounds inflicted by it raw. 'The brutal violence of heartless hierarchy triumphed over truth and conscience a great spiritual movement lay crushed under its feet.' Th words are not too strong, and few can fix their eyes on th head of gold or the arms of silver, while they are bein trampled under the feet of iron and clay. [*Daniel* ii, 31-33. 'I do not blame him for what he has said,' was the comment o the saintly Abbé Huvelin on a Modernist writer whose vein o humour was somewhat irrepressible: 'I blame him for havin said it without charity.' There were extenuating circum stances; the ambiguous smile with which St. Athanasius is sai to have met indiscreet questions as to the orthodoxy of Ma cellus of Ancyra may, perhaps, be in place. Marcellus, in h effort to avoid the Arian Charybdis, had gone dangerously near the Sabellian Scylla: but the saint, while unable approve, was not careful to condemn 'the venial errors of h respectable friend.' The reference to M. Loisy (p. 648) is *bêtise*. No one who has read *Autour d'un petit livre* can re gard him as wanting either in religious power or in passion

and Modernism was first and foremost a protest against falsehood posing as piety—against

> 'that all permeating mendacity which is the most alarming and desperate symptom of the present ecclesiastical crisis. What would it avail to exterminate these swarming legions of lies, if we still keep the spirit which breeds them?'—(*Mediaevalism.* George Tyrrell, p. 181.)

If such a protest is not religious, so much the worse for religion; if we have to choose between truth and seeming piety, we shall make a bad bargain if we do not choose truth. Heiler himself did not hesitate. His fate, he tells us, is 'inseparably bound up with the tragedy of Catholic Modernism.' Nor is he that sorry hybrid, an anti-Modernist Modernist—a scholar careful to separate himself from scholars and scholarship, to justify the executioners of 1907 and to disavow their victims, and to repudiate conclusions which it needs a magnifying glass of exceptional power to distinguish from his own.

3. He traces the beginnings of Catholicism, *i.e.* of traditional as distinct from evangelical Christianity, to the first days. For him, as for Sohm, 'the natural man is a born Catholic'; and the process of Catholicising Christianity followed close upon the death of Christ. But it lies outside the Gospel. The Jesus of the Synoptic narrative comes before us in the framework of His time and place, and within the limits of humanity. He founded no Church, instituted no sacraments, proclaimed no new religion; the enthusiasm of an eschatological hope possessed Him; He completed the cycle of the prophetic teaching which was the inheritance of Israel; for Him, the kingdom of God was 'at hand.' The difficulty of reconciling this position with that of the Catholic creeds is obvious. Heiler compares it with that by which the Church of the seventeenth century was faced when the Copernican astronomy established itself; or that experienced in the nineteenth when the results of palaeontology and anthropology won their way to recognition: these have been, that may be, overcome. But the parity

[2] Μόνον διὰ τοῦ πρσώπου μειδιάσας ὑπέφηνε μοχθηρίας μὴ μάκραν αὐτὸν εἶναι, καὶ ὡς ἀπολογησάμενον εἶχε.—Epiphanius, Hær. LXII, 4.

On the subject of Modernism, the reader may be referred to M. Albert Houtin's excellent *Histoire du Modernisme Catholique,* 1913; a book too little known in England.

between the cases is imperfect. In the one, the beliefs affected are secondary; in the other, central. If the predicates attached to Jesus by later theology are not to be found in His own teaching, or even in the New Testament, whence do they derive? The notion of Development will not help us. There is a μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος: the Nicene and the Scriptural Christologies are on different planes. It may be too much to say that the gulf between them is unbridgeable; it is not too much to say that, so far, it has not been bridged. This was felt from the first. It underlay the Arian and Nestorian controversies: the most that can be said for the Alexandrian solutions associated with the names of Athanasius and Cyril is that a decision in another sense might have brought about more and greater misconceptions. This is possible: but those occasioned by the answers acually arrived at were serious, and their political consequences were even more so:

> *'Triste siècle que le Ve siècle! Si l'on regarde à quoi aboutirent leurs querelles, on voit, au fond de la perspective, l'empire chrétien démembré, l'Eglise orientale irréparablement divisée, les lieutenants de Mahomet foulant aux pieds la Syrie et l'Egypte. Tel fut le prix de ces exercises métaphysiques.'*[3]

Those who busy themselves with such questions forget the limitations both of human thought, and of its instrument, language. It was a great saying of Scaliger that, with few exceptions, differences in religion come from ignorance of grammar. A philosopher, being asked whether Christ was ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, a 'mere' man, replied wisely, 'I will tell you, when you tell me what a "mere" man is.' This is a line of thought which may lead us somewhere: let us define our terms. Nor is the material environment of the disputants without bearing on their disputes. 'Le désert est monothéiste: voila pourquoi l'Arabie a toujours été le boulevard du monothéisme.' With

> 'The lively Grecian, in a land of hills,
> Rivers and fertile plains, and sounding shores,
> Under a cope of sky more variable'—

and, indeed, with the Aryan race as a whole, it was otherwise. 'Pour elle le distinction de Dieu et du non-Dieu est toujours resté indécise.'[4]

[3] Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, iii, 324.
[4] Renan, *Etudes Religieuses*, p. 67.

4. What Heiler speaks of as *Historismus*—we may call it the Historical Fallacy—is an intellectual fault which stands in the same relation to History as Intellectualism does to Intellect, or Rationalism, in the non-philosophical sense of the word, to Reason. It is, as he points out, a real danger to theologians; both because they are peculiarly apt to produce their facts, and so to take what is not for what is history; and because important, though not historical, values may attach to what is secondary, and post-, or extra-, Evangelical in religion. It is, no doubt, a temptation to extend this consideration unduly, *i.e.* to the province of belief, where it would bridge many gaps and resolve many *ἀπόριαι*. 'The historical origin of a phenomenon is never decisive as to its interior worth or unworth' (p. 4). This is very much too strongly put. Where, as is so often the case in Catholic theology, the assent demanded to a dogma extends to its history, the question of origins is vital: and what has been said of Christology applies to popular and traditional belief as a whole. Is it from heaven, or of men? If from heaven—if the Church can create or evolve doctrine, spinning it, as it were, out of her own substance, what limit is there to the process? If of men, it is subject to the vicissitudes of human things, and liable to revision. Under the influence of the critical and historical movement of the last half-century the Protestant Churches have largely, if tacitly, revised their traditional teaching; while leaving Scripture, interpreted by the best knowledge at their disposal, the ultimate standard. In this sense, which we may believe to have been that of its author, the famous maxim, that 'the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants,' is true. The latitude left as to non-fundamentals is large: 'the Gospel,' says Harnack, 'can consist with the Pope, as long as he does not make himself part of the Gospel.' But what Church has resisted the temptation to say *Dixit Dominus* of its distinctive *Aberglaube*? With regard to the Papal Church, Heiler, with the venerable author of the *Christian Year*, would have us

'Speak gently of our sister's fall.'

It would be easier to do so were the beliefs due to it left in the stage of popular superstition, or of opinions, pious or the reverse, which it is impossible to suppress. As it is, they have

been created into dogmas, and the faithful are forcibly fed with them. 'The infallibility and supremacy of the Pope,' says a living Catholic writer, 'is a dogma which rests on exactly the same authority as does that of the Godhead of Christ.'[6] Such sophisms are two-edged. For one person whom they hypnotise into accepting the figment of infallibility, they repel a hundred from faith in Christianity and Christ.

5. His separation from Rome, he tells us, was neither a separation from the *una sancta catholica* nor an abandonment of the corporate Christian ideal upheld by Augustine, Aquinas, and even, after a sort, by Calvin. So strong, indeed, is its appeal to him that a Catholic reviewer compares him to Balaam, who set out to curse, but in fact blessed, Israel: or to Abelard, with his equivocal *Sic et Non*. Will he end, it has been asked, at Canossa? Well, these are matters in which temperament, like the sword of Brennus, often outweighs reason, and wars against 'the law in our mind.' He is attracted, one might almost say obsessed, by the distinctive quality of Catholic piety—undoubtedly the strongest weapon in the Roman armoury; by the liturgy; by monasticism, by the great name of the Apostolic See. His departure from the standards of the Church is, indeed, wide; he speaks *e.g.* of 'the bloodless Two-Nature Dogma of orthodoxy'; 'loving devotion to Christ, faith in the Son of God made man, the following of the poor and humble Jesus, the worship of the Eternal Christ as King of Kings, love of the heavenly Saviour and Bridegroom of the soul—what (he asks) has all this to do with that *Christus-popanz*—that fantastic and unreal figure for which traditional apologetic contends? (p. 354). But he has an amazing power of doubling upon his traces, which often leaves us in doubt as to what he would really be at. A religion of law *e.g.* is foreign to the Gospel—*but* it was a condition of the establishment of the Kingdom; the Mass is unscriptural—*but* it has preserved the conception and practice of worship; prayer in an unknown tongue is a paradox, *but* it has secured the easily lost values of prayer. Most astounding, perhaps, of all, the celibacy of the clergy is a fertile source of vice and misery—'How much grossness and

[5] *Dogmengeschichte*, I, 304.
[6] Father Woodlock, S.J., in the *Church Times*, July 27th, 1923.

uncleanness, how much that is untrue and unnatural, how much perversity and mental disease, how much torture of conscience and conflict of soul, lies hidden under the specious exterior of clerical celibacy, no one who has not had experience of the practical working of the system can conceive' (p. 472); *but*—these evils are outweighed by the religious results which it secures to the Church. What a conception of religion! And when to sophistries of this kind we add the conception of the Church as a *complexio oppositorum*, and that of religion as essentially irrational'—conceptions which Heiler rides to death—one may go far. Like Newman's theory of Development, of which the Jesuit Perrone said *miscet et confundit omnia*, such methods enable those who use them to get anything out of everything. The magic of Egypt did so also—up to a certain point. But no further: here, as such arts will, it broke down.

6. It is not to the Catholic critic only that his conception of the unity of Catholicism will seem inadequate. This religion has been long enough in the world to justify us in taking it as a fact, not a theory; and it is a unity not only of polity and creed but of outlook over the world—*i.e.* of *Weltanschauung*. St. Ignatius would have us *sentire cum ecclesia*. This is more than belief, or submission; and the Catholic essence, or thing, is there. To stretch matters as far as this, no doubt, brings Catholicism from the ideal into the phenomenal order; and phenomena 'By laws of time and space decay.'

It is so: and this is why, great Christian Church as it is, the Catholic Church is neither Christianity, nor, even, primarily Christian; Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, have mingled with Jordan's sacred stream. The second century of our era was one of religious fusion, or Theocrasia.[7] It witnessed two Hellenizing movements in the Church: one, the Gnostic, *i.e.* the acute, which was successfully resisted; the other, the Catholic, *i.e.* the permeating, which was accepted in self defence. How much of the original freedom of the Gospel was sacrificed! The conquered imposed terms on the conqueror; a new age, a change compared to which the changes brought about either by the Reformation or by the Liberalism

[7] Harnack, *Wesen des Christentums*, ch. xi.

of to-day are insignificant, set in. The transformation was rapid; the perspective of the common Protestant denunciation of Rome, mediaeval and modern, is wrong. 'The First Pentecost saw the birth of the Catholic World Church' (p. 43); or, in the words of an English writer, 'Popery is a practicable form and a corrected expression, of the Christianity of the Nicene age.'

It is this immemorial antiquity of Catholicism, its compactness, its essential character as a logical whole, which is fatal to Heiler's vision of an Evangelical Catholicity. From every conceivable point of view, religious, historical, philosophical, the notes are mutually destructive; as well talk of a square circle, or a circular square. For the Catholic the religious question is a complex one—What must I believe to be orthodox? For the Protestant it is simpler—What must I do to be saved? *Sint ut sunt, aut non sint*, was the reply of the General of the Jesuits to proposals for the reconstruction of the Society; the Catholic theologian must say the same. No one has put this so admirably as M. Emile Faguet in his essay on Lamennais. The Liberal Catholic has different names in different ages; he is Lamennais, Fogazzaro, Tyrrell, Heiler—but, be he who he may, from the point of view of his Church he is a rebel; '*il en contredit absolument l'esprit.*'

> 'A religion is something more than a collection of dogmas; it is a society of men animated by the same general tendencies of conscience of mind, of will, and even of temperament. Now for centuries the Catholic Church has been authoritative herself, and upheld the principle of authority. She numbers, therefore, among her members and supporters all, or almost all, those whose temper is that of authority, who are conservative, and opposed to innovation; such persons, apart from any question of dogmas, find in her their natural home. On the other hand, the liberal, the reformer, the revolutionist as naturally becomes a Protestant, a free thinker, at best a Catholic only in name. What, then, did Lamennais propose to the Church? To renounce her historical tradition; to alienate the most numerous, the most energetic, the most devoted and influential members of her flock. No Church, no political or religious party will do so; a society is limited by its history and by the common will of its members; for its mentality is the product of both. Lamennais failed to see this obvious truth, because poet, orator, logician, and thinker as he was he was weak in history and in psychology. He never understood the Catholic temperament. He understood only his own, which was the reverse of Catholic; this was why, in perfectly good faith, he invited the Church to renew her strength by suicide.'[8]

[8] *Politiques et Moralistès du XIXe Siècle*, I, 123-125.

7. It is natural that to those who have passed through fire and water in their escape from religious tyranny the past should present itself out of perspective and, as it were, writ large. That the author of 'The Glories of Mary' should rank with St. Augustine and St. Thomas as a Doctor of the Church is certainly a paradox; but, given the Pope who raised him to that rank, it is very much what might have been expected: and there is more to be said of the Founder of the Jesuits than that 'in Ignatius the whole fabric of the Catholicism of the illiterate finds a support' (pp. 150, 153). On the other hand, public men must be judged by their actions, which are public, not by their personal dispositions which can be known only to the few; and, from this point of view, *edle* —*i.e.* noble—is surely the last epithet to be applied to the Pope of the *Pascendi* and of the Councils of Vigilance (p. 650). To use it of him is to make words lose their meaning: as well speak of the humane Torquemada or the virtuous Alexander VI. Those who are not personally concerned in it see the world of religious controversy on a reduced scale. Jowett, speaking to the present writer, of the Apologia, said, not perhaps without a tacit reference to his pre-occupation with superfluous topics of this sort, that the book discussed at great length the question whether Newman should, or should not, become a Roman Catholic—'not, I should have thought, a very important matter.' Yet surely no Church lives to so great an extent on a false reputation. Let us do justice to the piety which it has nourished, and continues to nourish; to the sense of the supernatural, impaired in other Churches, which it has kept alive; to the sacramental grace which it has made accessible to the multitude; to the religious observance and affective devotion, from which we in England have so much to learn. But it must not be forgotten that an almost prohibitive price has been paid for these things. There are two ways in which the Gospel may be preached to the poor: they may be raised to its level, or it may be lowered to theirs. The latter is that which has been adopted. There is a sense in which this Church seems to have retained aspects of the truth which have been obscured or lost in other Churches. But the gift of veracity—the essential gift of the Christian teacher—has been

denied her; the poison of asps under her lips outweighs these truths, and makes them ineffectual. This is why, attractive as it is—and is not all piety attractive?—Catholic piety is stronger on the affective side than on the ethical or rational. Catholics, it seems, feel their religion more deeply, and practice it with greater regularity than Protestants. But the impression left is not one of genuine spiritual power; nor are their moral standards high. The English are not a religious people; but they have a horror of murder unknown in Catholic Ireland, and their sex ethics compare favourably with those of the continent. If Catholicism—'that august and fascinating superstition,' as Macaulay calls it—attracts, it also repels strongly; and it is not those who are least accessible to religious influences that it repels. To many it seems that its *complexio oppositorum* and its *Irrationalismus* are foreign to the simplicity of the Gospel:

ἔσθλοι μέν γάρ ἁπλῶς, παντοδαπῶς δε κάκοι.

8. 'Everywhere (we are told) a strengthening and an advance of Catholicism is perceptible, not only in the sense of exterior expansion, but of interior regeneration' (p. 647); or, as a paradoxical English writer expressed it, 'people have no longer to explain why they are, but why they are not, Catholics.' Well, this depends on the people. But, for the continent, H. J. Holtzmann's carefully compiled statistics tell a different story;[9] and, for England, Baron F. von Hügel reminds us that 'the conversions to Rome, so numerous and remarkable between 1845—1870, have notably diminished, especially during the last decade';[10] the words were written in 1912, and the period in question is roughly covered by the pontificate of Pius X. Has the war changed the situation? There is reason to believe that it has aggravated it. The 'neutrality' of the Vatican, for which there was more to be said than is commonly admitted, did not raise the prestige of the Papacy either with the Allies or with the Central Powers: the result of the last nine years (1914-23) has been disillusionment, the acceptance of material standards, impatience of and disbelief in the ideal aspects of life. 'Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth.' The Church of Rome is not

[9] *Eternal Life*, ch. xii. [10] *Idem.*

our enemy; there is a sense, happily, in which all Christian Churches exercise a common ministry; in which none of them can regard the loss suffered by another as its own gain. Least of all can any wise or good man do so when, as now, the question is not one as to this or that form of Christianity but of Christianity; when, it seems, the fortunes and future of religion as such are at stake.

In a recent number of the *Journal de Psychologie* (April, 1923) will be found a letter addressed by Renan to Pêre Hyacinthe in 1883 on this subject.

> 'It is, I think, certain (he says) that the population of our great towns will not return to beliefs which can be described as supernatural, however small the admixture of the supernatural in these beliefs may be. These populations are positivist, not in the sectarian sense, but in that in which scientifically trained minds are so: no miracle, no revelation, no liturgy, no prayer for a particular or special object will command their assent. The efforts made to propagate these beliefs by educated persons who do not themselves hold them can only lead to reactions in a contrary direction; only faith can create faith. If a religious revival is possible, it can only be on ground lying on this side of the supernatural. In this province can there still be a question of Christianity? Would that it might be so! for in the word Christian an admirable tradition of idealism and of virtue is contained. Such Christianity is indeed near of kin to the purest idealism; never was there a religion so far removed either from superstition or from dogmatism as the Christianity of the first days.'

Forty years have passed since these words were written; and what was then true of city populations is now as true of agricultural. If there is still room for optimism, it is for a qualified optimism: it was only on the dial of Ahaz that the sun went back.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE*

By Professor F. W. MacBride, F.R.S.

WHEN any man ventures to address an audience of thin
ing men on the relation between religion and science, h
must expect to be asked to define his attitude towards each
these divisions of human thought, and this I propose to do
the outset, as briefly as possible. By profession I am a biol
gist, that is a man whose business it is to seek to learn the la
of life and to teach them to others, but I differ from many
my colleagues in believing that religion is a vital and irreplac
able element in human life.

It is not, however, the duty of a biologist to attempt
reconcile the fundamental ideas of religion and science.
course if he holds, as I do, that both these sets of ideas a
essentially true, he must attempt to make a synthesis for hi
self, but the provisional synthesis at which I have arrived do
not satisfy some of my nearest and dearest friends. To sugge
a synthesis which should help the ordinary man over his diffic
ties is a task for the broad and enlightened theologian. W
endeavour to-day is first, to explain to you why I consider re
gion to be vitally necessary to human society, and secondly
make clear what are the difficulties to be faced and overcom
if religious beliefs are to be harmonized with the scientific kno
ledge of the twentieth century. Religion might be defined
the belief that the Powers which control the world around us
that is, Nature—are interested in man, and are concerned in
forcing the rules of his morality by punishing infractions
these rules. It is true that Buddhism in its original form den
the existence of a Personal Intelligence at the heart of thin
but it nevertheless teaches that the framework of the univer
is such, that the 'wheel of things' will inevitably punish t
evildoer, and that he cannot escape the consequences of h
acts by death; for this will be followed by another life wh
character will depend on the previous one. It is significa
however, that the stern, orthodox type of Buddhism has ne

* Slightly altered from an address given to the Brotherhood, at
Helen's, on Sunday, September 10th.

formed a national religion; if we examine it, as actually practised and believed in by the mass of its adherents, we find that it is always mingled with a belief in spirits who have the power of interfering in human affairs.

If as biologists we survey the origin and growth of human societies, we see at once that religious belief forms the cement which has held them together, without which they could never have come into existence at all. For in every society the desires of the individual must be limited and controlled by a series of rules—whether they be called laws or tabus is immaterial—and it is latent or conscious religious belief which enforces the observance of these rules. The attempts of the Bolshevists to abolish religion have, in so far as they have been successful, produced social chaos but their success has been very limited, and the beliefs of the great mass of the Russian peasantry have remained unchanged. Though we naturally and rightly regard Christianity as the highest form of religious belief, yet we must not overlook the fact that all religions enforce morality in some degree, even though this morality may only concern itself with members of the same tribe.

The barbarous and cruel rites attending the initiation into manhood of the youth of savage tribes are stated by good observers to have a most salutary effect in developing courage and self-control among the young men; and if we recollect the ancient Greek belief in the Furies, surely if we consider the fierce passions and rough and ready methods of primitive times, it must be obvious that this belief was a most beneficial article of faith. If a son who, in a fit of anger felt tempted to slay father or mother, believed that he would be pursued by dreadful spirits who would torment him day and night till he had expiated his crime, he must have felt a powerful influence restraining his murderous desires. If an act was not threatened with awful supernatural penalties such as these, but merely with punishment meted out by fellow-tribesmen, then it came to be regarded as a mark of cleverness to commit the act and evade the penalty. In this light we are told that stealing was regarded by the ancient Spartans, and I greatly fear that much American 'smartness' belongs to the same category. I can never forget the remark made to me on board a transatlantic steamer by a

business man of very doubtful morals: 'Americans don't be lieve in God Almighty, and therefore have no scruple in going in for a life of libertinism.'

But, we are told, that many if not most of our leading men in literature and science have completely lost faith in the existence of God, or at least in His interest in human affairs, and yet lead honourable lives. I am not concerned to deny this, but two explanations of this phenomenon may be suggested. First, if we go back at most three generations, we find that the ancestors of these people held religious beliefs, and deeply ingrained ideas of right and duty connected with them. The momentum of the transmission of these 'prejudices' has not yet died out. Secondly, we discover that in their young and plastic years many of those who are now agnostics were subject to religious influences and imbibed principles of conduct which their subsequent changes of belief have been unable to modify. The late Prof. Clifford, who on the intellectual side was a materialistic atheist, was in his early manhood an Evangelical Christian: Prof. Romanes, the author of *After Darwin*, returned before his death to the bosom of the Church, and of him it was said that he continued to worship God in his heart long after he had ceased to believe in Him with his intellect.

In these days of the new psychology, with its 'repressed complexes,' we must never forget this basal layer of early belief in the mental composition of many who most loudly advertise their scepticism. If we could thoroughly eradicate religious beliefs from the minds of our people, we should produce social chaos here as certainly as it has been produced in Russia.

But besides its value in upholding social morality and with it civilization itself, religion is precious on another side. As Prof. Camille Flammarion has said, the longest human life passes like a dream; we do indeed spend our years as a tale that is told. When we are young, aggressive and defiant, the span of life appears infinitely long, and at times seems to pass too slowly for the accomplishment of our desires. The older we grow the more quickly does time seem to glide away, till we are ready to exclaim with Horace, '*Eheu fugaces labuntur anni*.' May I remind you of the old legend of the Saxon king of England, who was discussing with his thanes whether he should

admit the emissaries of the Christian religion? After the younger thanes had expressed their objections, the oldest thane of all said, 'O king, when on winter nights we are seated in thy hall grouped around the roaring fire, I have often seen a bird fly in from the outer darkness. A few moments it has remained inside refreshing itself in the warmth, and then it has flown out again into the darkness. So is man; he comes no one knows whence, and after a brief span of conflict and enjoyment he departs into the unknown. If these strangers can tell us aught of man's fate my counsel, O king, is that we should hear what they have to say.'

Hegel, the German philosopher, said that religion was a sketch in broad outlines for popular use of the current state of philosophical thought; and of philosophy it has been truly said that it 'lights no fire and cooks no kettle, but it brings back to us three things—God, Freedom and Immortality.' A modern Cambridge philosopher (McTaggart) has defined religion as an 'emotion resting on a conviction of a harmony between ourselves and the universe,' and in another place he says that it is the best thing in life. And indeed what better thing could there be than a feeling that the Powers ruling the universe were friendly to us, and that our ultimate welfare was safe in Their hands. Should we therefore cling to our ancestral religious beliefs and cherish them as the most precious things which we possess? Such is the deduction drawn by many earnest apologists for Christianity, such as the Bishop of St. Albans. In the conflict between the Church and the world, it is the world, they say, which has gone astray. Let the world therefore return to its allegiance to the Church, and peace and happiness will be the result.

But this solution is impossible. Religion will not fulfil its functions unless it is sincerely believed in, and we cannot compel belief by an act of will. If we are so fortunate as to have had parents, or other close friends whose lives were inspired and whose actions were moulded by a lofty religious faith, we may well have envied their happiness and have desired to appropriate these blessings to ourselves. It is possible even to hypnotize ourselves for a time into the belief that we have accepted the faith of our parents, but unless we have faced and

overcome the difficulties in the way and acquired a profound conviction of the truth of the belief which we profess to hold, our faith is like the house built on sand: the rain of adversity will descend and the floods of doubt will arise and beat upon that house; it will fall, and its ruin will be great. The house built on sand seems to me to be an apt description of many of the sermons to which it has been my fortune to listen. It was not without some reason that Abbé Loisy described the Church as an imposing edifice, to which nothing was wanting except the foundations. Only the most modern—perhaps I might even say the most scientific—religious teachers attempt to base their teaching on a foundation of history, thoroughly analysed and firmly established. Too many treat the texts of the Fourth Gospel as the very words of Jesus Himself, or they quote the sayings of the Jewish prophets as though they were the infallible oracles of God; or again, they take the thoughts of Paul as expressed in his Epistles, although saturated with Rabbinical doctrine, as dogmas on which a theology can be erected. In a word, their whole discourses are based on assumptions, some tacit, and others explicit, which come into violent conflict with modern thought.

It is, I think, the conscious or subconscious feeling among their hearers that clergymen frequently skate over thin ice in slurring over difficulties and escaping from dilemmas by phrases which accounts for our empty churches. It is vain to answer, 'What does dogmatic belief matter; let us concentrate on social work.' Right practice, as Huxley said, must be based on right theory. I myself am one of those who think that an enormous amount of damage has been done by irrational emotional philanthropy, and before we engage on social work we must have a clear idea of the end to be aimed at. Out of an unthinking and intemperate indulgence in our emotion of sympathy, we may be led to support measures which will increase the number of incompetent and lazy in our population, and will diminish the number of the self-reliant and thrifty. The laws of life are terrible and inexorable things which we disobey at our peril, and with all the seriousness of my knowledge of the biological results of such measures as I have indicated, I say that they will involve the decay and death of the society which enacts

and enforces them. In a word, emotion, however praiseworthy, cannot sustain itself on nothing; it must rest on some definite belief: and this belief, if it is to endure, must be brought into some kind of harmony with the other beliefs which we hold, for the intellectual outlook of each one of us is at bottom a unity.

For the general scheme of our thoughts about life and the universe, the Germans have invented the word 'Weltanschauung,' to which there is no exact equivalent in English. 'Outlook on Life' is the best translation of it, but this is an awkward phrase.

Now the Christian religion professes to be a 'Revelation,' that is a communication of profound and vitally important truths about the universe. This 'Revelation' is supposed to have been made two thousand years ago to a small, obscure people living near one corner of the Mediterranean. But all the ancient peoples who lived round the Mediterranean had many ideas in common, and some of these were shared by the Jews, and can be detected underlying the Christian revelation. As time went on and the Christian religion spread beyond the Jewish boundaries, it assimilated more and more of those ideas of the other Mediterranean peoples which the Jews repudiated: in a word it became thoroughly saturated with primitive magic, and this form of Christianity survives till the present day as Catholicism. The Protestant Reformation was a brave attempt to get rid of all accretions and to return to the primitive ideas with which Christianity started. In my judgment it is absolutely hopeless to attempt any reconciliation between scientific ideas and Catholicism; but Protestants are *ex hypothesi* pledged 'to prove all things and hold fast that which is true,' and it is to them that I address myself.

Underlying, then, the Christian faith as our fathers in Elizabethan times taught it was a definite 'Weltanschauung,' which has persisted as the tacitly assumed basis of religious teaching until the present day. Let me attempt briefly to sketch it. God created man in His image—that is, with moral principles and freewill. A single pair were formed and placed under ideally happy circumstances in a sheltered situation, where Nature provided food for them without any effort on their part. This pair deliberately rejected God's commands, and were in consequence

ejected from the garden and condemned to death. God becam angry not only with them, but with all their offspring as ye unborn. Further, by this act of disobedience, the moral natur of our first parents became corrupted, and this corrupte nature passed by heredity to their children, so that in conse quence all became liable to the pains of hell. As a result, al human beings from their very birth are in desperate need o salvation; and so God became incarnate in the Founder o Christianity and suffered death as the penalty of sin in place o the human race;[2] those members of it who rely on this sacrific and endeavour to obey the precepts of Christ are forgiven thei sins and after death partake of the endless pleasures of Para dise.

The God in whom the Jews believed is termed by them 'Th Living God.' By this phrase is meant that He is for ever ac tively interfering in the affairs of man, and especially in thos of His chosen people of Israel. If Israel is attacked by pestil ence, it is because her former King Saul has behaved treacher ously towards the allies of Israel. If a lasting drought bring famine, it is because Israel has forsaken Jehovah and is wor shipping Baal. The same atmosphere surrounds us in the Nev Testament. Paul in prison prays, and an earthquake shake the prison and sets free the prisoners. Indeed it is questionabl whether the Jews had any conception of natural law at all: i this respect they are inferior to the Greeks, whose phras 'Necessity' (*ἀνάγκη*) is at bottom identical with the modern con ception of law.

Many clergymen will at this point protest, and justly, th they do not teach the stories of the Creation and the Fall, an that they do not believe in them. But it is a difficult thing t take away the foundations of a house and leave the roof an walls standing. We may put to them such questions as these *viz.*: What do they then mean by the sin of man and by hi need of salvation? Do they, or do they not believe in the cor ruption of human nature? Are Mahometans, Confucians, Jew and Buddhists in need of Christianity, or are they not? Thes

[2] 'All lives that were, were forfeit once
And He that most the advantage might have taken
Found out the remedy.'

are examples of the inconsistencies involved in the theology of many of those who consider that they are modern and have assimilated scientific teaching. Those who have worshipped since their youth and have become accustomed to the old way of looking at things do not feel these inconsistencies, or are at most vaguely conscious of them; but the younger people feel them acutely, and in consequence the whole language of the Church, its threats and promises, seem to them empty, conventional phrases totally divorced from the reality which encounters them when they move outside the church door.

The people of this age are blamed for irreligion. No charge could be more unjust. The deep needs and instincts of man have remained unchanged. If a scientist like Sir Oliver Lodge and a literary man like Sir Conan Doyle think that they have light on the survival of the dead, the halls in which they speak are crowded to the door; and if Christian clergymen like the Bishop of Durham or the Dean of St. Paul's give the impression that they are not merely transmitting tradition but are endeavouring to look facts in the face, their churches are filled with young men and women. The plain deduction to be drawn from these facts is that the old 'Weltanschauung' and the doctrine based on it are dead. The appearance of life which they may still exhibit is due to the fact that the older generation has not yet passed away. When this generation disappears, either religion will have ceased to be an active force—with all the detrimental consequences which will result from its loss—or religious belief will be completely recast.

It follows that one of the most stupendous benefits which could be conferred on this nation would be a readjustment of its religious beliefs. Let us now consider briefly the difficulties which this readjustment will encounter. Of these the most important are three. The first of these is the utter absence of any evidence for the goodness of God in Nature.

> 'I find Him in the courses of the stars,
> But in His ways with men I find Him not,'

is the phrase which Tennyson puts into the mouth of the heart-broken King Arthur, and the biologist might re-echo this sentiment. Everywhere that he looks he finds warfare and struggle in Nature; everywhere terrible over-production and waste of

young life. A female cod will lay in one season 9,000,000 eggs; if she continues laying for four seasons she will have produced 36,000,000, and of these on an average only two will survive till they reach maturity. Perhaps most of you have seen the kestrel hawk, or 'wind-hover,' on the wing; it is a beautiful sight to see the bird poised almost motionless in the air, and then every few minutes or so making a swift swoop downwards. A single pair of 'wind-hovers' will destroy 10,000 field mice in a season. Mice, perhaps someone says, are only vermin, and from the point of view of purely human interests perhaps they are; but they are exquisitely-constructed animals, with well-developed brains and strong maternal instincts, and seem to have as much intrinsic right to live as hawks.

The terrible thing is that this warfare seems to be the only way of progress. Of this I shall give one instance which, as it has been comparatively recently discovered, may be new to my hearers. If we look at the earlier Tertiary deposits, those, for instance, which were formed contemporaneously with the clay on which London stands, we find in them remains of carnivorous animals superficially resembling our dogs, civet-cats and bears, but with smaller brains and less-developed teeth. What more natural than to suppose that as time progressed they developed and improved themselves with our modern dogs, cats and bears? But that is not what happened. One northern family developed further, acquired a large brain and better teeth, and then this family swept over all the world, exterminating all the others, and gave rise to all the carnivora living at the present day. And there is strong reason for believing that the same tragedy has been repeated in the human race. At any rate in Midglacial times, there is evidence that a race akin to the Bushmen lived in France. In the paintings on Egyptian tombs, we find pictures of the same race living in North Africa, and the narratives of early explorers reveal to us all Africa south of the Equator inhabited by this people. At the present time a dwindling population of a few families supports a starving existence on the Kalahari desert, persecuted and killed on every occasion by the ordinary African Bantu negro.

This brings us to the second great religious difficulty raised by science, and that is the origin of man and his place in

Nature. The evidence which has been accumulating for the last sixty years points unequivocally to the conclusion that man has been slowly developed out of the higher apes by the very same processes as those by which these apes were evolved from primitive four-footed mammals. If this is so, then the notion of man's early innocence and goodness and his fall and corruption due to his disobedience to the commands of God, vanishes into mist. Man's so-called evil passions are seen to be closely allied to the natural instincts of animals: they are in no sense evidence of a corrupted nature, but are part of the equipment which he shares with all the animal kingdom, for the existence of which God is responsible.

We see in mankind the same tendency to over-production of offspring and the same waste of young life. Plagues and wars were actually regarded by the Christian, Tertullian, as a provision of God for limiting the increase of the human race. If we consider it a mark of progress to endeavour to keep all babies alive, then we find that we are threatened with overpopulation and that we are being flooded out by people of defective minds, poor constitutions and feeble character. Struggle is the inexorable condition of progress in the human race as elsewhere. The Christian precepts of kindness, pity and charity must, like other general precepts, be limited in their application by reason.

The third and greatest difficulty which science raises for religious belief is the close connection between body and mind. We find that the activity of the brain, which accompanies all mental processes, is dependent on the proper action of the heart: a weakened circulation may be the cause of delusions. Nay, more; there exist in the body three or four mysterious glands which pour their products into the blood: if one of these be diseased and fail in its office, it may profoundly affect the mental deposition. Thus, owing to atrophy of the thyroid gland, a person may be virtually an idiot; yet if he be fed on sheeps' thyroid, mental development will be resumed and the sufferer may become a normal human being again. I do not mean to say that science enforces the acceptance of a crude materialism, such as the doctrine that living substance differs from dead substance only in the arrangement of its atoms and

molecules, and that what we call life and consciousness consist merely of the mutual reactions of these molecules. I confess that many of my colleagues believe in this view, or think that they believe it; but it is a theory which, when followed out by strict scientific analysis to its ultimate logical consequences, leads to such ludicrous contradictions that the most advanced biologists and psychologists, such as Driesch and Macdougall, have abandoned it.

But even if we agree that mind and body are distinct things and that neither can be explained in terms of the other, the fact that they always work together renders it exceedingly difficult to conceive how mind could survive or have any kind of life when the body has perished.

We are thus brought to the dilemma that science seems to have undermined and destroyed the bases of our religious belief, and yet that religious belief forms a cement without which no form of society can long endure. When I say 'long,' of course I mean 'long' in a historical or evolutionary sense. In the Old Testament God is reported as having said, 'If I find ten righteous in Sodom I will not destroy it,' and a leaven of people with strong religious faith will sustain for a generation a nation of sceptics. But 'the mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly small,' and when religious belief has finally died society will become disorganized and the people will perish. I said in the beginning of this address that it was the business of theologians, and not my duty, to suggest means of overcoming these difficulties, but I may perhaps be allowed to throw out some hints which may assist others in this all-important task.

I agree with Paley that for Englishmen, at any rate, the choice is between Christianity in some form or no religion at all, for if Christianity be finally rejected few, if any, will seriously put forward the claims of another religion. The first step, therefore, is to discover what are the features in Christianity which constituted its powerful appeal to the ancient world and which captivated the greatest intellects both in the time of the Roman Empire and in mediaeval and modern times. I think that there were two main factors in this appeal, *viz.* the goodness of God and the immortality of the human soul. Neither of these doc-

trines was new: in fact the doctrine of the survival of the soul dates back to glacial times, when ancient Palaeolithic man buried with his dead the implements which they had used during life: and again, the goodness of each national god towards his own folk was taken for granted, whilst there was a strong tendency to attribute to each such deity control of the powers of Nature.

But both beliefs at the time of the inception of Christianity had suffered a great decline: the trust in the power of the national god had been shattered by the utter inability of the god to protect his followers from being crushed by Rome, and the idea of the survival of the soul had dwindled into a hope so faint as to be quite unable to give any consolation to the worshipper. The renewed confidence in the immortality of man was the great impulse which launched Christianity on its career; and this confidence was entirely due to the impression made on the minds of His first followers by the appearance of Jesus after His death. In that age a belief in apparitions and spirits was fairly common, but these phantasms had nothing comforting or uplifting to communicate; in most cases their mission seemed to be to call for vengeance for some wrong done them whilst on earth. The Risen Jesus produced a totally different impression on the minds of those who saw Him; so far from being injured, He appeared in the light of a happy Conqueror: and He held, we are told, long and intelligible discourses with His disciples: He announced His intention of setting up (as they thought on earth) an imperishable kingdom where justice would be fully satisfied, and thus the surviving soul would be guaranteed its proper environment. It was just this lack of environment that had undermined the earlier beliefs in human immortality. Those who received these revelations had their view-point so altered, their values so transmuted, that no mundane misfortunes seemed to matter; and since the earthly life was such a transient phase of their existence, they were prepared to believe in the goodness of God which the Founder taught. That picture of the nature of God Almighty as a Father Who loves all His children on account of their humanity, irrespective of their race, is one to which—as admitted by believers and unbelievers alike—the human mind responds: we feel, I think,

that if God is not like that, that is at any rate what He ought to be like.

As you all know, during the late terrible war there was a great revival of interest in what is called spiritualism. The eager desire of those whose hearts were broken to know something of their lost beloved grasped at every supposed means of communicating with the dead. It is not for me to pronounce a judgment on the genuineness of these communications, but some mourners were thoroughly convinced, and in consequence passed from sorrow to confident hope and their whole outlook on life was changed: thus they reproduced on a smaller scale the experience of the early Christians.

In my judgment, the key to the revival of religion lies in the revival of belief in immortality. If this life be all, no belief in the goodness of God will stand the least critical enquiry. As McTaggart, the Cambridge philosopher whom I have quoted, says 'There are two alternatives: either our lives are meaningless or else they are episodes in a long chain.' If then human existence only begins here and has an indefinitely long hereafter, God, in spite of appearances to the contrary, may ultimately turn out to be good. I think that faith is essentially a determination to stake everything on the latter of McTaggart's two alternatives: in a word, we are prepared to 'bet' on immortality being true.

How shall this belief, so all-important, be revived? Most of us when young imbibe it from tradition; but this initial belief, if we are educated men and women, rarely survives adolescence. There are only two ways in which the problem can be attacked, *viz.* (1) by an analysis of our mental life, and (2) by a critical scientific examination of all reported appearances of and communications from the dead. I have already stated that the most modern and scientific of mental experts have been utterly unable to get rid of a soul, an ego, or subject (the name is a matter of indifference): they find that the attempt to reduce the mind to the reactions between molecules leads to absurdities. I may say in passing that many biologists find also that the mutual positions and chemical attractions of molecules are completely inadequate to explain the behaviour of the meanest animal or the lowest plant; and the confident assertion of Huxley that it is

as absurd to talk of the 'vitalism' of an animal as of the 'horology' of a clock—in other words, that the action of an animal could be explained from its structure if we thoroughly knew it, just as well as the movements of a clock—is becoming more and more discredited.

But the demonstration that there is a subject or soul in man does not prove immortality; it only renders it possible to believe in it if evidence from other quarters is forthcoming, and the only other evidence available consists of alleged communications from the dead.

The evidence for these communications should be studied with the most rigorous care and with initial scepticism. All reasonable people admit that if there are genuine appearances of, and messages from the dead—and the Resurrection of Jesus is supposed to consist of a series of these—there have been an enormous number of fraudulent imitations of them. Scientific men are as human and liable to error as anyone else, and individual scientists have on occasion been grievously taken in. As, however, interest in the subject grows and more and more able minds are devoted to the task, there may gradually emerge some general consensus of opinion in favour of the reality of these phenomena. If this consummation should be arrived at, belief in the survival of the soul will rest on as solid a basis as any scientific belief, for these beliefs depend on the agreement between the observations of many different workers. It will then be of no avail to say that such a belief would not fit into the 'scientific' view of the universe, for we have no right to make a 'scientific' view at all without taking all the facts into consideration. In conclusion I should like to quote a couple of paragraphs from Harnack, whom I consider at once one of the most earnest and most scientific of modern theologians.

'In spite of intense effort, our modern thinkers have not succeeded in developing a satisfactory system of ethics, and one corresponding to our deepest needs, on the basis of monism. They will never succeed in doing so. If this be admitted, it is in the last resort a matter of indifference with what names we designate the two sides of the dualism which, as moral and thinking men, we encounter: *cf.* God and the World, Here and Hereafter, Visible and Invisible, Matter and Spirit, Necessity

and Freedom, Physics and Ethics. Unity can be *experienced*, and one side can be subordinated to the other; but this unity is always reached by a struggle in the form of an endless problem, which can only be approximately solved, and never by the refinement of a mechanical process.'

'We are not able to bring our temporal and spatial knowledge into the unity of a consistent 'Weltanschauung' with our inner life. Only in the peace of God, which is higher than all reason, can we catch a glimpse of their ultimate unity.'

THE BURIAL OF LORD MORLEY*

By the Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A., formerly Vicar of St. Thomas's, Camden Town, N.W.

'Ye know that every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of Him.'
—*I St. John*, ii, 29.

LORD Morley was buried on Thursday, September 27th, 1923. The funeral service was held in the chapel of the crematorium, Golders Green, London. It was reported in the daily press, but scantily. Modern Churchmen may find some interest in the following account written by one who was present; it is complete, and pains have been taken to render it, in humble honour of its distinguished subject, accurate.

* Since this paper was written *The Times* (November 21st) has published the following extract from Lord Morley's Will: 'I desire that my ashes, after cremation, should be placed in some spot in Brookwood or other cemetery without ceremonial or spoken words. I fain would trust a lingering memory of me to the silent hearts of such as have been, and still remain, my friends.'

This expressed desire impairs some hopes which animated this paper; especially the hope that Lord Morley would be found to have approved, or at least to have permitted, the religious service held at his burial. That apparently he did not do. No doubt, the distinction might be made that the actual service was before cremation, whereas the Will prohibits a service after cremation. We must not take advantage of that nicety. On the face of it Lord Morley must be taken, we fear, at the date of his Will to have forbidden spiritual rites at his funeral altogether. At the same time nothing can change the facts of that solemn occasion; what happened, happened. And the record which is written in this article in every particular stands. It is not for the present writer to presume to attempt any reconciliation between the announced wish of that righteous man concerning his burial and the actual event. The present writer only ventures to believe that the religious service, while alas! it seems to have conflicted with Lord Morley's testamentary request, did not conflict with the profounder implications of his character.

Modern Churchmen, we say, may be interested. For Modern Churchmen, especially the elder among us, have been influenced from time to time, in one way or another, by this eminent *savant*. Take *On Compromise*. Written in 1874, its fierce veracity was a challenge to us all. Some of us at about that time, or a few years later, were young men aspiring to take Holy Orders; that was our dream, our haunting ideal. But we were hesitating, pulled this way and that, over the old difficulty of subscription. In view of evolution and of biblical criticism, how could we assent to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Creeds? And from amid the gloom of our perplexity the pointing finger of John Morley shot out at us and his voice commanded, 'Never prevaricate!' He seemed to have us specially in sight. Look at sentences like these :

> 'The spirit of the State Church is eternally entombed within the four corners of acts of parliament. Her ministers vow almost before they have crossed the threshold of manhood that they will search no more. They virtually swear that they will to the end of their days believe what they believe then, before they have had time either to think or to know the thoughts of others. They take oath, in other words, to lead mutilated lives. . . . The system ends by putting a premium on something too like hypocrisy. . . . It is no light thing to have secured a livelihood on condition of going through life masked and gagged.'

Some of us twinged and winced before this warning. It followed us about. It drove us in on ourselves again, and we tried at the centre to face the problem : on the one side, the searchlights of this prophet of truth; on the other side, that high Call, whose first whispers went back perhaps to childhood, which would not let us go. At least, one among us for weeks in 1881 walked over Warwickshire fields puzzling and puzzling at the summons of *On Compromise*, wrestling with its indictment, until at length he settled his account with it and wrote out his own determination in fourteen pages of notes which lie before him now.

John Morley's own religious position at that time was made quite clear. It was disdainfully negative. He wrote :

> 'Those who agree with the present writer are not sceptics. They positively, absolutely, and without reserve, reject as false the whole system of objective propositions which make up the popular belief of the day, in one and all of its theological expressions.'

And it was uncompromising. He wrote in just and stern reproof:

> 'We all of us know men who deliberately reject the entire Christian system, and still think it compatible with uprightness to summon their whole establishments round them at morning and evening, and on their knees to offer up elaborately formulated prayers, which have just as much meaning to them as the entrails of the sacrificial victim had to an infidel haruspex.'

That was John Morley's own spiritual attitude in the middle 'seventies. Pass over his later, more important, but more impersonal works. Pass across the years and come to his last book, written when he had become Lord Morley and an old man, published in 1917, his *Recollections*. The tone is mellow and deep; the bellicose mood is over; a ripe charity flavours the story; the sense of vast spiritual possibilities or probabilities in this mysterious universe is apparent; the window is held open towards the eternal. It is true that Lord Morley, if you demand denomination, still clings to the titles of unbelief. 'For myself,' he writes, 'if I were to have a label, I should be called a Positivist.' Yet listen to sentences like these:

> 'The last half of Book IV [of Wordsworth's *Excursion*] is among the finest things in great poetry. It is real religion.'
>
> 'His [Gladstone's] language would not indeed be mine . . . But the thought with which he rose in the morning and went to rest at night was of the universe as a sublime moral theatre, in which an omnipotent Dramaturgist uses kingdoms and rulers, laws and policies, to exhibit sovereign purposes for good. This was a thought which lighted up the prose of politics with a ray from the diviner mind, and exalted his ephemeral discourse into a sort of visible relation with the counsels of all time.'
>
> 'Yesterday [May, 1908] the Bishop of Lahore (Lefroy) called—one of the most attractive men I ever met . . . He carried me for a while into the upper ether . . . His ideas delighted me.'
>
> '[During a visit to 'Durdans,' June, 1892] Rosebery a charming companion. Before going to bed, he showed me a truly deep and beautiful page in one of Newman's Sermons. When I get the proper volume, I shall like to transcribe it.'

And now, September, 1923, his turn has come, and according to what he himself called 'the most melting and melodious verse in all the exercises of the English tongue'—

> 'After life's fitful fever he sleeps well.'

How will he be buried? Will there be a religious service? Will it be a Christian service? Will his family follow the precedent of Huxley, at whose funeral, July 4th, 1895, the service was read by his friend, the Anglican scholar and thinker, the Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, the honoured friend, also, of

some still living Modern Churchmen? Or will his family follow the precedent of Swinburne, April, 1909, by whose wish there was no burial service in the usual form, instead thereof the friends gathering round the grave and, if they wished, throwing into it flowers. Will Morley's funeral, as he goes hence and is no more seen, follow the smaller or the larger hope?

What happened was this. There was a Christian service. Lady Morley left the arrangement of it, in the words of the *Daily News*, to the 'tact, good sense, and discretion' of the Rev. H. Trundle, Vicar of St. Alban's, in whose parish the crematorium is situate. It was, in effect, the burial office of the Church of England, shortened and adapted with admirable discernment.[1]

The chapel, of oblong shape, is of limited size, and the congregation was numerically small, but in quality notable. There were relatives of Lord Morley, a representative of the King, leading Liberals of the old days and the new, representatives of Manchester University, &c.; perhaps forty or fifty in all. There were also some sixty or seventy friends of less note who were admitted to seats or standing before the rites began. Lastly, some two hundred,[2] as far as one could judge, of the public, who had been waiting in respect along the road, were admitted to stand together in silent sympathy at the far end of the building. This group included some Indian youths. It was a homely gathering. The ceremony lacked the splendour of functions in great cathedrals. It was more like 'family prayers,' but there was something intimate and rarely impressive in that quiet assembly of bereavement. There was no singing; but the Organist gently rendered music from Dvorak, Mendelssohn, Beethoven, and Chopin.

The Vicar met the coffin at the door and led the procession up the chapel till the coffin was placed on the bronze stand, at right angles to the left side of the building. He recited the two sentences:

> 'I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.'

[1] The notes of it given below were, with much courtesy, supplied or verified or corrected by Mr. Trundle.

[2] This and the preceding numbers have been checked by the Superintendent of the chapel, who counts entrants to the services.

'We brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.'

He then read the 23rd Psalm, in the Prayer Book version:

'The Lord is my shepherd: therefore can I lack nothing.

He shall feed me in a green pasture: and lead me forth beside the waters of comfort.

He shall convert my soul: and bring me forth in the paths of righteousness, for his Name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff comfort me.

Thou shalt prepare a table before me against them that trouble me: thou hast anointed my head with oil, and my cup shall be full.

But thy loving-kindness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost;

As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.'

Here Mr. Asquith, having previously been invited by the Vicar, stepped to the desk and read the Lesson, upon which the Vicar and he had agreed beforehand—the superb first Lesson for All Saints' Day, *Wisdom* iii, to verse 10:

'But the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall be no torment touch them.

In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die: and their departure is taken for misery,

And their going from us to be utter destruction: but they are in peace.

For though they be punished in the sight of men, yet is their hope full of immortality.

And having been a little chastised, they shall be greatly rewarded: for God proved them, and found them worthy for himself.

As gold in the furnace hath he tried them, and received them as a burnt offering.

And in the time of their visitation they shall shine, and run to and fro like sparks among the stubble.

They shall judge the nations, and have dominion over the people, and their Lord shall reign for ever.

They that put their trust in him shall understand the truth: and such as be faithful in love shall abide with him: for grace and mercy is to his saints, and he hath care for his elect.'

The four committal sentences, as given below, were read by the Vicar facing the coffin, which, during the reading, glided slowly through the small folding doors in the side-wall of the chapel to the cremation chamber beyond. Over these doors is inscribed in marble, *Mors Janua Vitae*. These are the sentences:

'Man that is born of a woman hath but a short time to live, and is full of misery. He cometh up, and is cut down, like a flower; he fleeth as it were a shadow, and never continueth in one stay.

In the midst of life we are in death: of whom may we seek for succour, but of thee, O Lord, who for our sins art justly displeased?

Yet, O Lord God must holy, O Lord most mighty, O holy and merciful Saviour, deliver us not into the bitter pains of eternal death.

Thou knowest, Lord, the secrets of our hearts; shut not thy merciful ears to our prayer; but spare us, Lord most holy, O God most mighty, O holy and merciful Saviour, thou most worthy Judge eternal, suffer us not at our last hour, for any pains of death, to fall from thee.'

The prayer of committal was by request omitted. Then followed:

'I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, From henceforth blessed are the dead which die in the Lord: Even so, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours.

Lord, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.'

The Lord's Prayer was here said together by the congregation—it seemed, with unusual earnestness. The first collect from the Prayer Book followed:

'Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity: We give thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world; beseeching thee that it may please thee, of thy gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect, and to hasten thy kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.'

Then came two closing prayers: the one, said to be of the sixteenth century and beautifully amplifying Morley's favourite line, 'After life's fitful fever,' &c.; the other, a cry for healing to wounded spirits.

'O Lord, support us all the day long of this troubleous life, until the shades lengthen, the evening comes, the busy world is hushed, the fever of life is over, and our work done. Then, Lord, in thy mercy grant us safe lodging, a holy rest, and peace at the last, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.'

'Grant, we beseech thee, Almighty God, that those whose hearts are now touched by sorrow may by thy divine compassion be set free from all fear and serve thee henceforward in holiness of life. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.'

The service closed with the ancient blessing:

'Unto God's gracious mercy and protection we commit you:
The Lord bless you, and keep you:
The Lord make his face shine upon you, and be gracious unto you:
The Lord lift up his countenance upon you and give you peace.'

Then the spell which had held that little company together was broken, and they scattered. But they had heard together murmurs of the river of the water of Life.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION AT THE CROSS-ROADS

By the Editor.

RECENT debates in the Church Assembly indicate that the practical solution of Prayer Book revision has not yet been achieved, nor is it likely to be achieved in the immediate future. There are three great obstacles to revision.

First, there is a disbelief that revision, such revision as it is possible to achieve in our Church assemblies to-day, is really likely to improve our Prayer Book either from the devotional or the literary standpoint. None can have used the Prayer Book faithfully without having learnt to reverence it, and without having had their devotional ideals and literary taste moulded almost unconsciously by it. As a consequence it is only natural for such persons to shudder at the proposal to combine these ancient services with modern liturgical compositions. It is like supplementing Westminster Abbey by adding Westminster Cathedral to it.

Secondly, there is a haunting fear that to depart deliberately from Prayer Book uniformity by admitting optional alternatives either in whole services or in portions of them must destroy the unity of the English Church by eliminating what has been a fundamental mark of it since the Reformation. The unity of the English Church, it is maintained, is dependent upon the uniformity of its services. That policy of comprehensiveness, inaugurated by the Tudor statesmen and reformers, has allowed of great doctrinal latitude within the English Church, but this, it is argued, can only be maintained by inflexible uniformity in rite and ceremonial. If this be deliberately relaxed or exchanged for a policy of alternative options, the result will be either 'a go-as-you-please Church in which a naked individualism expresses itself in an Asiatic luxuriance of rites and ceremonies, and doctrine is as elastic as worship,' or else a Church in which on the one hand our present divisions of Evangelical, Anglo-Catholic, and Liberal will be

hardened up and their adherents permanently segregated, and on the other hand bishops harassed beyond measure by frequent appeals to arbitrate in jarring local discords produced by the pitched battles of parishioners over the optional alternatives to be episcopally licensed.

Thirdly, there is a deep-seated suspicion that neither the bishops nor the clergy may be trusted with the administration of the proposed system of optional alternatives. The more Protestant-minded laity believe that this policy of optional alternatives would be used by the Romanizers, whom they regard as greatly on the increase, to Romanize the English Church even in the face of the most heroic opposition of the faithful English laity. A very moderate revision of verbal and doctrinal archaisms and redundancies they would be willing to accept, and also a few simple additional prayers and services; but a mode of revision which seems to threaten the dissolution of the English Church in a welter of strife and confusion and the possible replacement of it by a Romanized Anglican sect eagerly seeking the first opportunity to submit to Rome is something they feel bound to oppose to the uttermost.

It is not surprising that as a consequence the prospects of revision look black, for a very powerful and able Anglo-Catholic section are resolved not to grant what is called 'reasonable revision' without receiving as a *quid pro quo* a large measure of legal freedom for 'Catholic rites and ceremonies' which the more old-fashioned Churchmen regard as out of place in a Reformed Church.

This then is the *crux* of the position: either the Church must make large concessions to the Anglo-Catholic party or it must forego revision; but if it is to have a revision which is to include both the Anglo-Catholic demands, and also the 'reasonable revision' of educated Englishmen, the only way in which it can achieve this is by the method of optional alternatives. Bishops Henson, Headlam, and Pollock, who are liberal and learned prelates, have cast their weight against Prayer Book revision by this method. We are not surprised. The situation is beset by difficulties and dangers, and we should feel every inducement to adopt their attitude and postpone revision if it were not for three weighty considerations.

First, it seems impossible to go on in our present condition of disorder. The Prayer Book is legally obeyed by none of the clergy at present. Many adhere to its spirit, although unwillingly unable to adhere to its letter; others, a powerful Romanizing and mediaevally-minded section, are resolved to have what they regard as Catholic rites even though prohibited by the rubrics and custom of the Church of England. It is impossible to compel the obedience of this latter body, unless the Prayer Book is so revised as to admit of its being obeyed by the generally loyal and well-disposed. Of course our present disorders may not be the worst of evils. They may be mitigated by firmness, judicious promotion and the modern education of ordinands. The extremists may go off to Rome, and loyal clergy, who are determined to obey the spirit of the Prayer Book and adhere to its principles, may in due season prevail in overwhelming numbers. Unfortunately the signs are against this. We believe that the extremists being ordained greatly outnumber the moderate men.

Secondly, although we desire reasonable revision, which will remove from our services not only verbal archaisms, but also such doctrinal archaisms as everlasting punishment, an expiatory Atonement, the original sin of the offspring of Adam, the plenary verbal inspiration and historicity of Scripture, &c., which the revelation of the Spirit in these latter days has rendered increasingly incredible, and in some cases morally repulsive as well; yet we recognize the different degrees of illumination in the Church in these matters, so that what seems to be falsehood to us still seems to be truth to others. Hence, believing that the claims of Christian fellowship demand consideration for our Traditionalist brethren, we should, even if we were able, prefer not to deprive them of traditional doctrines and mediaeval forms against their wills. We believe in education and not in compulsion, but we recognize that the uniformity which can be achieved by education is still far off. Such a situation as the present seems to demand at least two types of services. This need not split the Church. There are two alternative Communion Offices in the Episcopal Church of Scotland, but there is no schism. We all probably recognize the value which a policy of liturgical uniformity had in Tudor

times, but the same policy seems to have produced most unhappy results in Stuart times. We believe, subject to certain safeguards, the policy of uniformity may be safely and profitably departed from to-day. Without such a departure it would seem impossible to keep the Church of England either truly loyal or wisely comprehensive. When we say this, we do not advocate alternative Prayer Books, but in certain cases optional alternative services, and in other services optional alternative portions. And here, we need hardly add, that any congregation which prefers to adhere to the present Prayer Book services shall have a perfect right to do so. All parties are agreed on that. Moreover, we do not for one moment think that the decisions of the parishioners (for the decision should be with them) as to which of the authorized services should be used in their parish church would be a fruitful cause of contention or of discontent. In a number of parishes, we should expect to see all the services in use either at the parish church at different times or in the chapels-of-ease and mission churches. When Englishmen are entrusted with responsibility they grow gravely responsible; when their sense of fair play is appealed to, and they are asked to consider the spiritual needs of those whose liturgical ideals differ from their own they will be found ready to make every possible concession. What they cannot bear is clerical autocracy or underhand methods. If they are trusted, and if they are treated courteously, we have every confidence that the predictions of those who prophesy strife and bitterness as a result of granting them freedom to decide in these matters will be falsified. Moreover, it is still possible to make revision experimental, and to enact that unless after, say, three or five or seven years the revision has justified itself it will be automatically repealed. We think, however, that any unprejudiced observer would admit that a new spirit was observable in the recent discussions on Prayer Book revision. Strong ecclesiastical party-men showed themselves ready to make concessions. In this we believe that they were moved not by diplomatic motives, but by a spirit of fellowship and mutual consideration. It was this spirit which enabled a decision in favour of alternative uses to be carried; and it is the advent of this spirit, which, if we mistake not, justifies optimism for the future.

And that word 'the future' constitutes our third reason for revision. We must look ahead. Dr. Percy Dearmer has recently emphasized in trenchant terms the falling percentage of Church people at Church services. We dare not discuss the much-debated reasons for this, but it is obvious that besides an improvement in the quality of the preaching, variety and modernity in our services would attract many who are now indifferent or antagonistic. And this last, only alternative options can give us.

It is these three reasons which compel us, notwithstanding the grave difficulties in the way, to support the policy of Prayer Book revision by alternative options. 'To do nothing when we ought to be doing something is the height of rashness,' said Francis Paget.

If our conservative Churchmen, instead of opposing revision by alternative options, would combine and concentrate on the policy of giving the parochial laity legal authority to veto any departure from the present Prayer Book services or from the customary hours of service, they would be doing much to safeguard what they have most at heart. If there is a distrust of the clergy and bishops by the laity, too often, we fear, it is reciprocated. Yet until the laity are trusted and given real powers of local church government, and the clergy come to regard themselves not only as *servi Christi* but also as *servi servorum Dei*, there is little prospect of helpful reform. At any rate, there is no real reason to anticipate that a Further Powers Measure which concentrated on the rights of the laity in the matter of their parochial services and was content to exclude all questions of Church patronage from its scope, would have any difficulty in passing the Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council. Here is a policy in support of which conservatives and liberals might well combine, and the Life and Liberty Movement organize and direct the united effort in view of that Movement's projected campaign to increase the Church membership inscribed on the parochial rolls. That campaign, laudable as it is, can, we are convinced, achieve no permanent success until the Parish Councils are conceded legal powers of control over obnoxious and autocratic alterations in the parochial services.

THE ABIDING SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS*

CYRIL EMMET AND HIS FAITH

By E. W. Barnes, Sc.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster.

Matthew xxiv. 35: [Jesus said] Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

RATHER more than two months ago one of the most gifted of the younger ministers of the Church of England went to New York to preach a series of sermons and to give a course of lectures. He preached but one sermon. Then came influenza, pneumonia; and, within a week, all was over. Cyril Emmet thus died at the age of forty-eight, with his rare promise unfulfilled. In theology he was counted a Modernist. And, as all who knew him were well aware, he combined a sympathetic understanding of modern scholarship and science with a firm and beautiful faith. He was entirely free from the fear, still far too common, that Christianity dare not come to terms with modern knowledge. He was always ready to plead for patient re-examination and, if necessary, for bold re-statement of Christian dogmas. Prolonged study and thought had intensified his reverence for Christ and his conviction of the truth of the Lord's revelation. He brought the qualities of an acute intellect and an attractive personality to his endeavour to win men to accept Christ as Teacher, Master, Saviour. For too long he was allowed to remain in the relative obscurity of a small Berkshire parish. Yet he was daunted neither by poverty nor loneliness. Study, thought and natural vitality made him, to use Bacon's words, full, exact and ready. When finally he was called to important work at Oxford, the range of his powers became quickly and widely recognized. Several times he preached from this pulpit, and I personally cherished the hope that some day he might be added to our body. We looked to him as a coming leader during this time of religious unrest and development. Our hopes are shattered. God's ways are inscrutable. He has died, relatively unknown; and we can but mourn his loss. The only sermon which he preached in New York had for its subject, 'The Significance of Christ to-day.'

* A sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, Sept. 23, 1923.

I have not seen the sermon; but, in memory of him, I have been led to choose the same theme this afternoon.

What did Jesus mean to Cyril Emmet and what does He mean—or should He mean—to all of us? He is—let us frankly admit the fact which modern scholarship has emphasized—in some ways an obscure Figure in history. A village artisan of an outlying province of the Roman Empire. A brief ministry. An early death. Secular historians of the time have practically nothing to say of Him. An obscure allusion in Suetonius, a single sentence in Tacitus, a passage, probably not authentic, in Josephus—and that, save for an occasional Rabbinical calumny, is all. He had been dead more than a hundred and fifty years before the intellectual and official classes of the ancient world deigned to concern themselves with the fact that He had ever lived. All that we know about Him is contained in a few brief and—it is not too much to say—fragmentary records of His life and teaching; and these records, our Gospels, were not written in the form in which we have them by men who had known Him personally. Why then has His name lived? Why has He exercised so profound an influence on the thought of the most progressive races of mankind? We do not know when He was born. Of His youth and early manhood we are almost entirely ignorant. We do not know how long His ministry lasted, nor even the year in which He died. He perished miserably, a criminal's end. And yet He is to-day the central Figure of the world's history. Emmet, as I know from conversations with him and as is, indeed, evident from his writings, felt to the full the force of this surprising paradox. Yet he was too shrewd a man to press it to absurd lengths. Of those who said that the Jesus of history is a myth, the creation of fancy and legend, he was scornful. He knew that history cannot be so re-written. Against those who would minimize the originality of Jesus or belittle the power of His personality, Emmet contended vigorously. 'Mark's Gospel,' he said, 'is a drama in which the opposing forces are the popularity and the hostility evoked by Jesus. Wherever Jesus appeared these at once burst into flame. He attracted tremendously or He repelled tremendously. The Gospels witness to this on every page. They do not talk of the power of His per-

sonality, but it is there. Quite certainly when He was on earth Jesus was one who counted, one who made things different wherever He came.'

At the very centre of Emmet's faith was the belief that Jesus still counts, that He still makes things different, and further that to the end of time He will be for humanity a great transforming influence. This conviction was not the consequence of uncritical enthusiasm. Emmet accepted Carlyle's dictum that 'a man's religion is the chief fact about him.' And he held that the religion of mankind would increasingly be fashioned by the religious sincerity and certainty of Jesus. By our Lord's character and personality he was strongly attracted. The beauty of our Lord's temper, His genius in insight and phrase, His psychical strength, appealed powerfully to Emmet. But, as he said, 'behind the character and personality of Jesus was His religion, His immediate and unbroken consciousness of God.' Other teachers before Jesus had witnessed to God. If they had occasionally spoken of Him as Father, this was but one of a hundred different ways in which they had shaped their thought. God's omnipotence, His omnipresence, His power, His readiness to punish had been equally emphasized. But in the mind of Jesus there were not a dozen notions of God jostling one another for first place. He dropped all the other phrases: practically He called God Father and nothing else. This conception dominated all His teaching. God is our Father. We are, jointly and severally, sons of God. Human life, in its deepest spiritual significance, is the life of brothers in the Divine Father's house. The will of the Father is supreme, but it is exercised in love. So God is no remote monarch, quickly stirred to wrath. With pity and tender care He regards His children. He is near, accessible; and those who seek His presence shall find it.

This teaching with regard to God, Emmet declared, is at once the central thing and historically the most certain thing in Jesus. 'It is also,' he affirmed truly, 'the abiding secret of Christianity.' Of course the teaching must be interpreted by the way in which the Teacher wove it into His own life. We must elucidate it by His example. We must combine it with the significance of His death and of His triumphant personal

activity after death. The Spirit of Christ lives upon the earth; and, as it passes into the hearts of men, it creates the change that 'makes possible fellowship with God and a right relation to our neighbour.'

Therein is the abiding significance of Jesus the Christ. Men often turn from organized religion with impatience, contemptuous of its formalism and failures. But as the best and wisest seriously search for a new spiritual dynamic, they find themselves drawn anew to Jesus and His revelation of God.

In Christian thought all the really fruitful movements have been inspired by the attempt 'to fathom more of the meaning of the Lord's characteristic teaching and to recover its consistent simplicity. And this perennial return to the Gospels and to Jesus is not artificial or conventional, but of very necessity. There is something there which draws men in spite of themselves.'

But thought which does not avow itself Christian feels a like impulse. All our social legislation has, as its spiritual basis, the vision of progress through brotherly love. We may resent our obligations, and count the cost too great; but, somehow or another, the Spirit of Christ constrains us. In international affairs the League of Nations is a direct development of Christian idealism. We may say that it won't work: the lusts of the flesh and the pride of life are too strong. But, and surely through the influence of Christ, hope persists. The vision remains and will remain. We shall continue to

> 'hope, till hope creates
> From its own wreck the thing it contemplates.'

The struggle with animal appetites, with greed and sensuality, with the cunning and filth of the jungle, is not yet at an end. It will, so far as one can foretell the future by our knowledge of the past, endure for thousands of years. But there has been marked progress, since Christ and through Christ. Men sometimes deny this truth; and, in argument, would measure the range of Christ's influence by the policy of Churches called by His name. But His spiritual influence is not confined to any one Church, nor is it limited to the aggregate of the various communions where He is revered. It is all pervasive. Moreover, if we read history aright, we must realize that it spreads

as the world grows smaller. Where racial strife and religious bitterness, intrigue and duplicity prevail, it is absent, whatever be the badges men choose to wear. But, as recurrently strife ends in desolation and weariness, there comes a return to the teaching of the Artisan of Nazareth, 'unknown and yet well known,' 'dead and yet alive for evermore.' Different civilizations, different stages of civilization, now crowded together by the shrinking of the world, have bred of late an enormous confusion. Yet, out of the confusion, man's spiritual instincts will emerge, purified by pain; and the purest kinds of spiritual intuition find in Christ's Revelation a magnet and a goal. Why it should be so, we cannot say. We must be content with the fact that human nature is so constructed that man, in his spiritual development, is drawn to Christ. When we argue as to the truth of His Revelation of God, the result is inconclusive. Thought will not take us all the way. It is from the deeper emotional regions of our being that full conviction arises. When the depths of personality are stirred, and that inexplicable change occurs which the psychologists term 'sublimation' —or, in the old evangelical language, when conversion takes place—then men know for certain that Jesus had the truth and was the truth. Then they say: we were blind and now we see. That they may fail to be loyal to their vision is undeniable: the flesh lusteth against the spirit in a continual conflict. But even failure is more fruitful than absence of vision.

> 'What I aspired to be,
> And was not, comforts me.'

To attain to the knowledge of the love of God which was in Christ Jesus is to find the gateway to Eternal Life.

And so, as Emmet declared, 'the impression made upon us by Jesus is not of a limited greatness which was afterwards exaggerated. It is rather of an unfathomed volcanic personality, which was in reality far greater than any interpretation men could give of Him.'

Stories early gathered round Jesus. In the Gospels there are, as it were, explanatory pictures whose objective truth scholars debate. Since the early centuries of the Christian era men have sought to interpret Christ by elaborate metaphysical and psychological theories. To pictures and theories Emmet

came with an open mind. If he felt dissatisfaction with them, it was not because they raised Jesus too high, but because they were all, as he said, 'partial, one-sided, inadequate to do justice to the central Figure of history.' Jesus lives: He continues to be of permanent significance to humanity: He is the world's Redeemer; because 'by what He was and by what He taught, He revealed to mankind the perfection of God and of man.'

O Father, Who didst send Thy Son Jesus Christ to be the Light of the World, pour Thy Spirit upon us that, seeing the Light, we may follow Him along the path that leadeth to Life Eternal. Amen.

BOOK REVIEWS

DR. SCHWEITZER IN A NEW ROLE*

The reviewer was once told by one who had been reared as an Unitarian that *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* had been one of the two books that had made him a Catholic Christian. It is, indeed, obvious that the ablest of anti-Liberal-Protestant manifestos, Loisy's *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, has as its basis an extreme 'eschatological' theory, as also has another piece of Catholic apologetic, Tyrrell's *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*.

Yet there is no denying that this type of Catholic apologetic has failed to survive the official condemnation which was passed upon it. Loisy himself has advanced, or retreated, into Positivism, and Tyrrell has gone where theological problems no longer present themselves, or not, we may hope, in precisely the same form. And to-day Schweitzerian doctrines are discovered, not in Catholic manuals (where milk and not meat is the nourishment offered), but in the Preface to Mr. Shaw's *Androcles and the Lion*. Perhaps those who trembled when they read the *Quest* may seem to have been right.

Schweitzer's own retreat as a medical missionary to the edge of the African primæval forest raised the question whether his strange views on the historical Jesus might not, after all, serve as a basis for a religion sufficiently vital to flee civilisation in order to bestow the benefits of modern surgery upon the suffering bodies of negroes. Possibly, under present circumstances in Europe, such a flight is not so difficult to explain, yet the fact requires some explanation, for all our theological Professors (perhaps unfortunately for theological progress) do not run off into the jungle, and so Schweitzer's conduct still remains exceptional.

The little volume before us sheds some rays of light upon this enigma; for here we have Schweitzer's own philosophy of religion.

We discover, in the first place, that he is a dualist, though a dualist with reservations:

> 'All problems of religion, ultimately, go back to this one—the experience I have of God within myself differs from the knowledge concerning Him which I derive from the world. In the world He appears to me as the Mysterious, marvellous creative Force; within

* *Christianity and the Religions of the World*, by Albert Schweitzer. (Allen and Unwin; 3/6 net; 1923.)

me He reveals Himself as ethical Will. In the world He is impersonal Force; within me He reveals Himself as Personality. The God who is known through philosophy, and the God whom I experience as ethical Will do not coincide. They are one, but how they are one I do not understand.'

Our author proceeds to trace this dualism to its source in a duality, not of reality, but of outlook or perspective. We see two Gods because we see Nature from outside, while it is from inside that we see ourselves:

'The knowledge concerning God which is derived from Nature is always imperfect and inadequate, because we perceive the things in the world from without only . . . In myself, on the other hand, I know things from within. The creative force which produces and sustains all that is, reveals itself in a way I do not get to know it elsewhere, namely, as ethical will, as something which desires to be creative within me.'

This solution of the dualism which J. S. Mill and Huxley discovered in experience and taught to their generation, does not strike us as very satisfying. To some extent it does solve the dualism between mind and matter; but not, we think, that between the ethical and the non-ethical. The cruelty of the cat to the mouse is experienced with some vividness *from inside* by the victim, but this does not change the quality of the action. You will not easily persuade the mouse that inner experience reveals the innate goodness of things—and of the cat among the rest. The mouse will resist such sophistry, even if he cannot resist his tormentor.

Furthermore, there are elements in our own inner experience which are far from revealing themselves as ethical will. It is not only the dualism between inner and outer experience, that is the difficulty. What oppresses us is just what oppressed St. Paul, *i.e.* that our inner experience is divided against itself. Dr. Schweitzer does not resolve this dualism.

So far as we can see, there is only one way of resolving it, and that is one which our author only mentions to reject—the method of Evolution. But it is only a rather superficial view of evolution that he takes. He just alludes to the disappointments which idealists have suffered owing to the War; but that is to take a very parochial view of evolution. The biologist, the physiologist, the geologist, and the anthropologist, are not so easily discouraged. They can touch and handle the evidence of evolution; they know, too, that it is a slow business; that there are setbacks, and *culs de sac*, but that on the whole there has been genuine progress. There is in things a *nisus* which will not be denied—an *elan* which will get through or over or around the obstacles somehow.

Now, according to the theory of evolution, the dualism between one side of our inner experience and much that takes place in the outer world, on the one hand, and another side of our inner experience on the other, lies in the fact that here we have two different stages of evolution facing one another. The more advanced stage—the human moral consciousness, is revolted by the behaviour of the lower stages. It is no doubt a difficulty that such lower stages should exist, but if you are going to accept evolution at all, they are a *sine qua non*. The later products spring out of the earlier; and if you ask why things came into being in such a way, and were not created all at once in their ultimate perfection, that is one of the questions to which there is no answer; but it is also one of the questions which none but an imbecile would ask.

Thus we protest against the radical dualism introduced by Dr. Schweitzer between the world of Nature and the world of inner experience. Inner experience, we should say, is not comprehensible apart from a know-

ledge of Nature; and Nature is incomprehensible apart from our inner experience. One sheds light on the other just because the two are organically related. A man cannot separate himself from Nature any more than he can lift himself up by the seat of his trousers. Not even the idealist can get away from Nature; whether we like it or not, our roots are in the soil, and we must assume that it is the best place for them to be.

When Dr. Schweitzer talks about religion not being meant to explain the world, and describes it as a weakness in a religion that it should have sprung from a contemplation of the natural world, he is to our mind, selling the pass. Christianity, both in its creative period and in its golden age, had an answer to every question, scientific or philosophical, which man could ask. They may not have been the right answers, but they were the very best answers available. And Christianity to-day, but for those who are trying to push it into a *cul-de-sac* out of mistaken zeal for what they quaintly and ignorantly call orthodoxy, would have its reasoned *schema* of science and philosophy; it would not be content to point men to some *asylum ignorantiae,* some cloud-cuckoo land of ignorant certitude (or dogmatic scepticism) where they might find peace and be at rest. Only a dying religion lacks a consistent philosophy of the Universe.

Religion cannot be based on the moral consciousness only, as Schweitzer seeks to base it. Feuerbach drew the logical and inevitable conclusion of such a theory; religion is a dream, no more. Riddled throughout by an all-permeating subjectivism, religion is doomed to pass when men shall have awaked out of sleep. Better is Mr. Bertrand Russell's Free Man's Worship than the veneration of a phantom, our own ghostly shadow cast on mists which the sun, as it rises higher, will dissipate.

We have dwelt so long upon the author's philosophy of religion and neglected the historical section of his work, partly because his historical attitude is so well known, but partly because we feel that the association of radical historical criticism with a poverty-stricken religious philosophy is calculated to do serious harm to liberal scholarship. The enemy will blaspheme, and we have had about enough of their blasphemies. J.C.H.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM FOR THE UNLEARNED.*

In 1562, Theodore Beza, the great Biblical scholar of the later Reformation period, obtained as the result of the sack of Lyons by the Huguenots, a Codex of the New Testament taken from the monastery of St. Irenæus in that city.

In 1581 he presented it to Cambridge University, in whose keeping it has remained ever since as one of its chief literary treasures. This Codex, which consists of the *Gospels* and the *Acts* (the latter a good deal mutilated), written in Greek and Latin on opposite pages, has been known ever since as the *Codex Bezae,* and is represented by the symbol D. It was written in the sixth century in Southern Europe, but it represents a text which was widely circulating, at least as early as the middle of the second century. This text differs in various respects from the other great codices of the Scriptures. Some of the most important of these variants are in the *Gospel of S. Luke* and the *Acts.*

Canon J. M. Wilson's untiring mental activity has led him, at an age when most men would rest from their labours, to produce an English translation of the Acts according to the text of the *Codex Bezae.* This translation, by means of leaded type and square brackets, indicates plainly wherein

* *The Acts of the Apostles,* translated from the 'Codex Bezae' by Canon J. M. Wilson, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 3/6 net.)

the Bezan text differs from that of our Bibles. Many of its variants are of no little interest, for they suggest the accurate knowledge of the eye-witness, *e.g.* in the deliverance of S. Peter from prison, D states that Peter, after passing through the iron gate, *went down the seven steps* (xii. 10). That S. Paul taught in the school of Tyrannus at Ephesus daily *from the fifth till the tenth hour* (xix. 9). It gives the Decree of the Council of Jerusalem in a different form, *viz.* 'That ye abstain from idol sacrifices, and from blood, and from fornication, and whatsoever ye would not should be done unto yourselves, ye do not to another' (xv. 29).

It is not easy to decide what is the relation of this text to the one generally received, but Canon Wilson is clear as to the answer, and indicates certain very important results which follow if his answer be accepted. These results point to *Acts* being written as early as 57—59 A.D. and *S. Luke's Gospel* earlier and of course *S. Mark* earlier still. Canon Wilson, with his wonderful gifts of lucid exposition, has taken all this trouble, not for scholars who can read their Greek Testament, and have studied the problem of the Western text, but for those who cannot read it in the original tongue. We wonder how many will make use of his labours.

H.D.A.M.

BEAUTY AND RELIGION.*

'Worship ought to be beautiful. I think it should be one of our great privileges to increase the beauty of the worship that we offer to God, because after all, He is the First Author of Beauty.' Most modern-minded Christians will agree with these words of Miss Maude Royden. The English Church, owing mainly to the Anglo-Catholic Revival, which in one of its aspects was aesthetic, has done not a little to cultivate the sense of beauty in things ecclesiastical. It has not, perhaps, taught its adherents good taste, but it has taught them that beauty ought to be united to worship. We must think of God as the Eternal Goodness and as the Eternal Truth. It would be well if we also thought of Him as the Eternal Beauty. 'O Thou Beauty, so ancient and so new, too late have I sought Thee,' exclaimed St. Augustine, but even a modern theologian would hardly be so daring as to address God in this way. Yet it is becoming more and more needful with the terrible temptations to hideous ugliness which modern industrialism is creating, that men should feel that when they sin against beauty they sin against God, and that if they are enabled to preserve what is beautiful, or perhaps to create it, they are performing an action which is both moral and religious. The devastating destruction of natural beauty, which is being perpetrated throughout the world, without any twinges of conscience, by the pioneers of western civilisation, can only be checked by a system of public education which places the Beautiful beside the Good and the True as objects of regard and reverence. Miss Royden in this book of addresses deals mainly with the moral and spiritual beauty of the Old and New Testament. Such teaching is valuable, but we need to be plainer and to deal in the pulpit and class-room with the sins of ugliness and bad taste, and their unpleasing sisters, dirt and untidiness. We lower our eyes from contemplating a beautiful building and they fall on a street made needlessly repulsive by dirty papers, empty cigarette boxes, and flaunting advertisements. A system of popular education which included Beauty as one of its subjects would help to remove these jarring discords, and in time render them impossible. 'Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely . . . . think on these things' was a primitive Apostolic injunction. H.D.A.M.

* *Beauty in Religion*, by A. Maude Royden. (Putnam's; 3/6 net; 1923.)

SUNDAY SCHOOL BY CORRESPONDENCE.*

The work of a Camp Chaplain in Argentina may be understood to involve a certain amount of travelling. The English community is widely scattered, and the problem of services resolves itself into one of locomotion. But if the difficulties of ministering to the adult population are considerable, yet more formidable are those which face the clergyman who has in mind the needs of the children.

Necessity is the mother of invention, and the result in this case has been a Correspondence Sunday School, which has met with a very large measure of success. The object has been to assist parents in the religious education of their children. A book of lessons is sent; notes on these lessons are dispatched every fortnight by the Chaplain (including notes on Teaching Methods, Child-Psychology, and so forth); children receive occasional letters, and both parents and children are visited so far as circumstances permit. Teachers also forward specimens of the children's 'expression work' to the Chaplain.

Mr. Mills is to be congratulated on his enterprise, which must involve him in a considerable amount of labour. It is, however, the sort of labour that pays; for a child can be made into something, whereas adults will remain very much what they are until they begin to degenerate.

We are not aware how far the English Colonies have attempted methods similar to those of Mr. Mills. The colonial bishops might do worse than recommend them to their clergy. As for their adoption in this country, it strikes us that they might fit in remarkably well with the 'self-teaching' methods devised by Miss Hetty Lee, and practised with conspicuous success in many schools. We advise our readers to get hold of this pamphlet and study it for themselves. J.C.H.

* *New Methods in the Correspondence Sunday School*, by the Rev. J. Y. Mills. S.P.C.K. (Pamphlet).

MALEBRANCHE.*

Malebranche was born in 1628 and died in 1715, and was thus a contemporary of Pascal's, who was, like himself, a Cartesian and a Catholic. Delicate health had fostered in him at an early age the love of a quiet, contemplative life, and in 1660 he entered the Oratory. It was here that he came across Descartes' *Traité de l'homme*, and 'the joy of becoming acquainted with so large a number of discoveries caused him such palpitations of the heart that he was obliged to stop reading in order to recover his breath.' He was especially attracted by what might have been expected to revolt a devout mind, *i.e.* the idea of a universal mechanics extending over the sphere of physiology.

Fifteen years later, his *Recherche de la Vérité* was published, a work which secured the approval of Arnauld, Fénélon, and Bossuet, and the congregation of the Oratory passed a special vote of commendation. Malebranche was, indeed, the author of many important works, but his *Entretiens sur la Métaphysique* may be regarded as the finished exposition of his philosophy, and it is of this that Mr. Morris Ginsberg has given us a translation. As a writer, Malebranche, consistently with the French tradition, is clear and elegant, though somewhat prolix. He was interested, however, in scientific researches and in metaphysical speculation rather than in literature; he perhaps felt that the ideas contained in

* *Dialogues on Metaphysics and on Religion*, by Nicolas Malebranche. Translated by Morris Ginsberg, M.A. G. Allen & Unwin (Library of Philosophy), 1923. 16s. net.

books were too often an incubus to the inquiring mind, rather than an inspiration; he was not of the Renaissance so much as of the Enlightenment.

Malebranche described his own philosophy as an expansion of the Pauline text, 'In Him we live and move and have our being.' God is the *ens realissimum*, containing within Himself all that is real in finite things, although He is neither exhausted by them, nor partakes of their limitations. He was profoundly anxious, however, not to have his views associated with those of '*le misérable Spinoza*,' and emphasized a doctrine of creation similar to the traditional view. His explanation of the existence of relationship between God and the world is known as the theory of Occasionalism. God is the cause of everything that happens. Natural causes are only occasional causes (*causes occasionelles*—hence the name). When a ball is set in motion by another ball, that other is not the cause; there is no necessary connection between the motions of the two. The concussion of the balls is only the *occasion* for God's imparting to the ball that was struck some of the motion of the striking ball. The power that moves bodies is that which created and preserves them. And, as with bodies, so with minds; we can neither perceive, nor will, nor think, apart from God.

All this may seem sufficiently fantastic to the plain mind. Yet it is one way of solving the insoluble problem of causation, though it seems to go a long way round, and is not likely, perhaps, to commend itself to-day. But finality attaches to the speculations of no philosopher, or school of philosophers; they do but explore roads, and sometimes these prove to be impassable. Malebranche, at any rate, was an adventurous explorer, and he wrote at a time when the ark of the Church had not ceased to float in the main stream of scientific and philosophic progress. That brave ship contained such sailors as Pascal, Fénélon, Arnauld, Bossuet and Malebranche, and even Newton, Descartes and Leibniz were willing passengers. J.C.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

PAPERS IN MODERN CHURCHMANSHIP.

SIR, *To the Editor of the* MODERN CHURCHMAN.

It is intended shortly to commence the publication of a series of papers or pamphlets dealing with the various doctrines of religion from the point of view of Liberal Christianity. Series of small manuals on Church doctrines have been issued in the past by members of other schools of thought in the Church of England, and some are being projected at the present time. This makes it all the more important that a similar effort should be undertaken by Modern Churchmen.

The present series is planned to consist of from thirty to forty papers, on such subjects as the Trinity, the Atonement, the Divinity of Christ, Old Testament History, Inspiration, Miracles, Sacraments, the Church, Orders, Christian Ethics, Missions. Each of the papers will consist of from 3,000 to 4,000 words, and they will be published at the rate of two (or three) a month. They will be written in popular language, and their appeal will be to men and women who are already modernist at heart rather than to those who need to be persuaded of the reasonableness of re-stating Christian belief. Many people to-day, especially amongst the younger generation, find it impossible to reconcile Christianity, as they

frequently hear it expounded in the pulpit, with a frank and fearless acceptance of the results of modern investigations in history and science. Though instinctively religious, they believe that they are compelled to choose between religion (in the only form in which they know it) and the preservation of their intellectual honesty. It is hoped that these papers will show them that a sane and vital Christian faith is possible which does not ask for any weakening of their devotion to the claims of truth.

The series will be issued under the auspices of the Junior Section of the Churchmen's Union, whose Chairman (the Rev. C. F. Russell, Headmaster of King Edward VI School, Southampton, late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, Hulsean Lecturer in 1922-23) is acting as editor.

In connection with the scheme, attention has to be called to one matter of urgent importance. The terms which can be made with the publishers, and the price at which the separate numbers can be issued, depend upon the possibility of a certain minimum sale being guaranteed. It is hoped that incumbents of churches will expose the pamphlets on book tables, and all those who are able to do so are earnestly asked to purchase copies of each paper as it is issued. If a sale of a couple of thousand copies of each could be guaranteed, it would probably be possible to issue the papers at the price of *3d.* It is therefore of the utmost moment that every reader of the *Modern Churchman* who can help in this way, to however small an extent, should do so; it would be deplorable if, with so much activity of the kind among other Anglican schools of thought, the present attempt should fail for lack of sufficient support.

Orders should be sent to me—

(Rev.) G. V. W. Sibley,
Hon. Sec., Junior Section, C.U.
41 Claremont Square, London, E.C.1.

CHURCH TUTORIAL CLASSES.

Sir,

I appeal with some confidence to members of the Churchmen's Union to assist the Church Tutorial Classes Association. The *Modern Churchman* is pledged to maintain the cause of truth. The Church Tutorial Classes Association seeks to help those who, although they have not had the advantage of a theological training, are prepared to make a real effort to seek for truth.

Church Tutorial Classes were started in 1917 ' to provide opportunities for the honest and thoroughgoing study, under expert guidance, of the fundamental principles of the Christian faith, of the Bible in the light of modern scholarship, of the origin and history of the Church, of the practical application of Christ's teaching to the life of to-day, and of other religious subjects.'

At present the Bishop of Manchester is President; Dr. Matthews, Dean of King's College, and Mr. A. Mansbridge Vice-Presidents; and Canon Durell, of Clapham, is Chairman of the Executive Committee.

That need exists for some such movement is obvious. On the one hand we find people dabbling in modern theology without understanding it. Such persons are under the delusions (*a*) that modern scholarship is destructive rather than constructive, and (*b*) that modern scholarship has lowered the moral demands and severity of Christ. Thus modern scholarship is regarded by many, not as a second Socrates, challenging them to give a reason for the hope that is in them, but as a second Protagoras, authorising them to select their own theology and morality according to personal taste.

On the other hand, many are alarmed by modern scholarship and tend to become dualists, the dualism being not between the body and the rest of the man, but between the 'heart' and the 'head.'

No profession of faith is required of any of the members of a Church Tutorial Class. The only restriction that is implied by the word 'Church' in the title C.T.C.A. applies to the tutor of a class. The tutor must not only possess 'both adequate scholarship and ability to teach adults,' but must also 'be a Churchman or Churchwoman.' This restriction implies that the tutor is not only a lecturer, but also a representative of the Church, that a Church Tutorial Class is not merely a debating society, but a course of instruction to improve efficiency and strengthen *esprit de corps*. The tutor must be prepared to trust the class to think for themselves and 'to follow the argument loyally whithersoever it may lead.'

The word 'Tutorial' indicates that C.T.C.A. does not aim lower than the University Tutorial Classes which have been evolved for the study of such subjects as Social Economics. Consequently members of Church Tutorial Classes undertake to do their best to attend three sessions, each session consisting of twenty-four meetings. A meeting consists of both lecture and discussion.

A class chooses its own subject. The subject may be changed each session. Experience suggests that it is best for a new class to start with the Old Testament; nearly all the existing classes have done so.

At the moment the chief needs are (*a*) Tutors, (*b*) Propaganda, (*c*) Money.

(*a*) *Tutors.*

There is a serious shortage of persons who are both (i) competent and (ii) available to act as tutors. To those who are competent, but by reason of other work not available, one can only say 'Is it possible that it may be more disastrous to scrap the tutoring than to scrap some of the other work?' To those who require what is called in the army a 'Refresher Course,' before acting as tutors, one can only quote the Ipswich Diocese as an example. Ipswich is paying the expenses of the General Secretary to visit Ipswich once a week this winter to conduct a 'Tutors' Course' for potential tutors who require further reading before they can become tutors of Church Tutorial Classes. The subject chosen for this 'Tutors' Course' is Old Testament. It is hoped that the 'refreshed' potential tutors will start Church Tutorial Classes on the Old Testament in autumn, 1924, and that the 'Tutors' Course' will at the same time turn on to the New Testament. It should be noted that we have lay tutors as well as clerical, and that some of our tutors are women.

(*b*) *Propaganda.*

The General Secretary would be glad to hear from anyone who is ready to get up a meeting about the Church Tutorial Classes Association, or to receive a preacher on the subject. The Camberwell Rural Deanery has set a splendid example of combined effort to help the movement.

(*c*) *Money.*

We are very short of money for running the Association. Donations would be gratefully received. Subscribers of not less than 5/- a year become members of the Association, and thus have a voice in the election of the Council.

J. W. POVAH.

Further information may be obtained from Major J. W. Povah, B.D., 73 Gordon Mansions, Gower Street, W.C.1.

1st November, 1923.

CONFESSION IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

To the Editor of the MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

What prompts me to write is the article you published recently, entitled 'A Protestant Confessional.' It is a subject upon which I have thought and felt deeply with some inside knowledge of what the Confessional means. I suppose we are all agreed that Confession in the abstract is good for the soul, and that it may be the right course to take in certain cases. But what kind of Confession? Is it confidence, or is it submission to judgment, and if the latter, whose?

At present there has grown up in the Church of England a frank imitation of the Roman practice, which some twenty years ago, I think, was recommended on P.B. lines, but alas! is so no longer. It is taught from hundreds of pulpits as a Divine Ordinance, perhaps not *sine qua non,* but *sine qua paene* sins of a 'mortal' character can be forgiven or remitted. Even in the case of 'venial' sins (the origin of this distinction is well known) it is a duty (unless you suffer from 'obstinate ignorance') to submit your faith and morals to the judgment of a 'Catholic priest.' It is assumed that those who hear confessions will hear them all in the same (distant) way, impose 'penance,' and give or promise Absolution. As the doctrine has increased in hardness, so it has grown steadily more popular, and has also won increasing support from the official clergy, our Fathers in God, in fact. Oddly enough psychologists, too, have rushed in to give it a much-needed commendation. Oppose the principle, and you are lost! Either your character is bad, or you are a hopeless bigot. Persecution (I verily believe) will not check the movement. Many who are not really Anglo-Catholic are drawn into its vortex. Let us not take any step against it, lest haply we be found to be fighting against God!

Now surely this calls, if it be so, for much serious inquiry. There are two ways of approach to the subject which no intelligent man will neglect. They are (*a*) Theology, and (*b*) Experience.

Theology first. I do not propose to adopt a learned or dogmatic attitude, and lest you think you have here the professional dissenter, I would draw your attention to my signature below. I would merely raise some points. The question I want to put are these:—

(1) Is it reasonable to suppose that Confession to a selected individual has any power in God's sight to make the sin less, or to expunge it from God's record? The well-known Commission to the Twelve may be quoted, but I am not satisfied. I say, is it in accordance with the tenour of God's self-manifestation for me to suppose that when I have found a willing ear into which to pour the story of my life's errors, I have in any way altered it, *i.e.* for the better? When I hear the words *Absolvo Te* (or whatever else it be) am I the purer thereby in God's sight? I do not think I am, and I do not think that anyone who has made the experiment really thinks he is, unless it be *per superstitionem.* In fact, those who resort to the Confessional, excepting certain types of souls, appear to be confusing two different things, *viz.* ceremonial purity and actual improvement. But God's judgment upon sin under the Gospel is surely of a *realistic* nature. Has it anything at all to do with ceremonial purity? I trow not. I am spiritually the worse by my deed. Repentance comes. I win power (never mind how) to live my deed down. In the act of so doing I experience the grace of God. It is nothing to me that many Anglo-Catholics will quite agree with me in this. I want to get to the bottom of their dogma that

I should make a sacramental confession. Of course, I am aware of their arguments *a latere argumenti*. But if they agree with the outline I have given above, what becomes of the connection of their Service with the Commission to the Twelve? Do they believe it, or do they not? Upon what else do they build their Sacrament of Penance? Is it Tradition? I say Tradition is the greatest quicksand imaginable, if it is set against the tenour of God's truth.

What actually brings about God's remission of sin? What earthly guarantee have we that either Confession or Absolution will do it? Only a dubious text. That is my first point. The Confessional (I say it boldly) leads people to believe that they are forgiven when they are not, and *vice-versa*. It conduces therefore to (*a*) a perilous pride, or (*b*) a dangerous 'wretchlessness' and desperation. It does both these things: let no one contradict experience.

Your F.B., Sir, is a person of quite another sort, I see, for he pronounces, wisely, no Absolution. All good success to his endeavours! But I ask, is there *no* use, *no* meaning, in priestly absolution after all? Surely there is this meaning, *viz.* '*We* absolve you; and *may* the Most High ratify the same. *We* are but men, and cannot know your heart; but *if* it is true, we are able to state, as a material fact of our theology, that God willeth not your death. Go in peace.'

Yes, that is all, just all, that is contained in it, in fact, and in the P.B. I think myself he is a fool who would despise it: but I do say that it clearly reveals to us what the Anglican position is. It is not, and never has been, the Roman position. There are two kinds of Confession; one is Protestant, and the other is *Papal*. I stress the last word. Ours is the former kind.

I remember a discussion I once had with a dignitary. He said our Church was a Protestant-Catholic one. I ventured to remark that I should like to interpose an 'and.' There are some points on which we are not Protestant at all, and there are others, surely, on which we are profoundly, not to say exclusively, Protestant. The P.B. on Confession appears to be one of the latter, for it says 'if he cannot be satisfied.' Is it not time to *rub it in*, and *press this great truth home?*

I have little to say on the head of experience. My own is that, as far as I can recollect, I never felt an atom the better for either Confession or the following Absolution, but indeed became rather the worse thereby. I had not the advantage of knowing little or nothing of the Bible or of my own soul either. I will only say that it was not till I rent the mantle of illusion that I began to grow. I learned the meaning of 'hope.' I understood better the meaning of 'conversion.' I realised that God giveth not His Glory to another. I began to understand the *fundamental truth* that sin is only forgiven when it has been conquered, short of death, and that the word of Absolution is no necessary or even plausible help to its conquest. It simply does not *work* like that: nor does Confession.

Well, I am not making one: these are general truths of one's experience. Let me conclude:

We want to get back to realities—*e.g.* to view the Church as the body of believers rather than as a Tribunal imposed upon humanity.

My position is just this, that Confession is not salvation, either in theology or in experience. And if it is not salvation, but only an exceptional way thereto, the claims that are now being made for it are dangerous in an exceptional degree.

Because of it youth holds aloof from Holy Orders. It is extraordinary what a horror well-educated youth has of being meddled with, especially in

affairs of the soul, and how widespread is the notion that that is what the Ordinand must undergo.

Because of it many laity are distressed, and more are utterly confused. Because of it the Church is divided into two opposed and opposing parties, Catholic and Protestant, with diminishing room for the 'Mediate' who is suspected or despised by both.

I have been fifteen years forming these opinions; and naturally I do not wish to advertise myself, and therefore sign myself as being somewhat but not wholly against my will:—

A LIFE MEMBER OF THE E.C.U.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION.

To the Editor of the MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

If we are to have the Summary of the Law as an alternative to the Ten Commandments in the new Prayer Book, would it not be well to follow St. Luke rather than St. Matthew, and instead of letting such Summary appear to represent the teaching of our Lord, make it clear that on the contrary it represents the ideal of the Old Testament, and that our Lord's teaching goes beyond it? The implication of the Old Testament ideal is that love for God should come first, then love for yourself, and finally love for your neighbour *as much as for yourself.*

The implication of our Lord's teaching is that love for one's neighbour should come first, because in it is involved love for God, and that love for self simply should not come in at all.

An alternative form embodying that idea was recommended by the Diocese of Kootenay to the General Synod when the Canadian P.B. was being revised, and a great opportunity was missed when the recommendation was not adopted. It ran thus:—

Alternative Form.

God spake these words, and said: I am the Lord thy God: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.

People. Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

Priest. Hear also what our Lord Jesus Christ saith: A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another.

People. Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

It was also suggested that when the Ten Commandments were read *in toto*, the New Commandment of our Lord should always be added after the 10th Kyrie, with its own Kyrie printed after it: 'Lord have mercy upon us and incline our hearts to keep this law.'

Might it not be well to bring forward some such proposal in the revision of the English P.B.? This would effectually guard against people thinking that the Church holds up the Ten Commandments or the Summary as representing the complete Christian law.

PRESBYTER IGNOTUS.

N.W. Australia.